Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-074
Tuesday
17 April 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-074 *17 April 1990*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Problems of Destroying Chemical Weapons Cited *[Moscow Radio]* 1
Deterrence Seen as 'Outdated Concept' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Apr]* 1

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Soviet Forces Commander Discusses Northern Group *[Warsaw PAP]* 3

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Shevardnadze Briefs Press on U.S. Visit 4
Worldwide Issues *[TASS]* 4
U.S. Relations *[Moscow Radio]* 5
Italian News Agency Interview *[Moscow International]* 5
Havel Proposes U.S.-Soviet Summit in Slovakia *[Moscow Radio]* 5
Bush-Thatcher Talks Yield No New Ideas *[Moscow International]* 5
Petrovskiy Addresses UN Conference in Japan *[TASS]* 6
Frolov Receives Visiting Academics *[PRAVDA 12 Apr]* 7
Frolov Meets With Austria's Zdenek Mlynar *[PRAVDA 12 Apr]* 7
People's Labor Union Member Interviewed *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 14]* 7
Restored U.S. Presence at Cam Ranh Bay Possible *[IZVESTIYA 14 Apr]* 9
Reasons for Ambassadorial Shakeup Explained *[IZVESTIYA 15 Apr]* 9
West's Approach to European Security Criticized 10
'Unconstructive' View *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 Apr]* 10
'Unacceptable' Decision *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Apr]* 11
U.S. Trade Policy Toward China Reviewed *[Moscow International]* 11
UN Transnational Corporation Commission Meets *[TASS]* 12

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

TASS Analyst Views Dole's Baltic Aid Remarks 13
Shevardnadze Receives Former Senator Gary Hart *[TASS]* 13
More on Senator Mitchell's Moscow News Conference *[PRAVDA 13 Apr]* 13
Cheney, Fitzwater on Arms Control, Summit Agenda *[IZVESTIYA 9 Apr]* 14
Decision To Declassify Stealth Fighter Viewed *[PRAVDA 8 Apr]* 14
Alaskan Businessman on Cooperation Prospects *[IZVESTIYA 11 Apr]* 15
U.S., Philippines Make Date for Negotiations *[TASS]* 15

China

CPC's Song Ping Discusses Sino-Soviet Relations *[TASS]* 15
Li Peng To Visit USSR 23-26 Apr *[Moscow International]* 16
Visit Viewed *[(Roginov) on Moscow International]* 16
Sino-Soviet Relations Enter 'New Era' *[Moscow International]* 16
U.S. Peace Corps To Return to Sichuan *[Moscow International]* 17

Northeast Asia

PRAVDA Reports Debates at MPRP Congress *[12 Apr]* 17
Mongolian Hural Session Scheduled for 10 May *[TASS]* 18
Draft Laws Sought *[TASS]* 19
Korean Air Begins Flights Over Soviet Union *[IZVESTIYA 8 Apr]* 19
News Conference Held on Air Route *[Moscow International]* 19
Businessman View USSR-ROK Cooperation *[Moscow International]* 20
USSR-ROK Academic Cooperation 'in Motion' *[Moscow International]* 21
ROK Participation in 'Rimpac' Drill Criticized *[Moscow International]* 22
DPRK Economists Describe 'Taean' System *[PRAVDA 6 Apr]* 23
Pentagon To Dissolve Mock-Soviet Air Wing *[Moscow International]* 23

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Inconsistency of U.S. Policy on Cambodia Viewed *[Moscow International]* 24
UN Participation in Cambodian Solution Examined *[Moscow International]* 24
SRV Economic Reform Brings Corruption Problems *[IZVESTIYA 7 Apr]* 25
Philippines's Laurel Urges Nonviolent Solutions *[Manila THE MANILA CHRONICLE 12 Apr]* . 26
Women's Group Leader Reviews Philippine Visit *[Moscow International]* 26

Near East & South Asia

Anniversary of Geneva Accords on Afghanistan Noted *[TASS]* 27
U.S. Role Seen Necessary for Peace *[Moscow International]* 27
TV Correspondent Reports From Afghan Front *[Moscow TV]* 28
Afghan Leader Airs Current Policy *[Moscow Radio]* 28
Soviet POW Returns From Afghanistan *[IZVESITYA 12 Apr]* 29
Commentary Analyzes Indian-Pakistani Tensions *[Moscow International]* 29
New Israeli Satellite Fuels Near East Arms Race *[PRAVDA 9 Apr]* 30
Israeli Businessmen Cited on Cooperation *[IZVESTIYA 11 Apr]* 30
Talks Held With Egyptian Delegation *[TASS]* 31
Iran-Saudi Dispute Over Hajj Quota Analyzed *[Moscow International]* 31
Anreyev Commentary on Iran's Urban Congestion *[Moscow International]* 32

Sub-Saharan Africa

Aid for African Countries To Be Reviewed *[Moscow TV]* 32
De Sousa Comments on Angola Independence Talks 33
Outlines Base for Peace *[Moscow International]* 33
Talks Renewed *[Moscow International]* 34
Ethiopian Peace Talks in Sanaa Viewed *[Borisov on Moscow International]* 34
Drought, Fighting in Northern Ethiopia Reported *[Yevgenyev on Moscow International]* 35
Namibia's Upcoming UN Membership Examined *[Valentinov on Moscow International]* 35

East Europe

'Vremya' Interviews GDR's Lothar de Maiziere *[Moscow TV]* 36
First Steps of New GDR Government Studied *[PRAVDA 15 Apr]* 37
Punishment of Corrupt CPCZ Officials Viewed *[Moscow International]* 37

West Europe

Shevardnadze Welcomes Italy's De Michelis Visit *[Moscow Radio]* 38
Shevardnadze, De Michelis Hold Talks *[Moscow Radio]* 38
Vorontsov, Gubenko Meet De Michelis *[TASS]* 38
French Army Chief To Meet Military Leaders *[TASS]* 39
Moiseyev Meets With Schmitt *[TASS]* 39
Dumas Advises French Rightists on Lithuania *[PRAVDA 9 Apr]* 39

Latin America & Caribbean

Abalkin Optimistic About Soviet-Cuban Ties *[PRAVDA 13 Apr]* 40
Cooperation Commission Meets *[Moscow Radio]* 40
'Friendly' Consultations With Cuba Conclude *[Moscow Radio]* 40
Eastern Bloc-Latin American Cooperation Viewed *[Moscow International]* 40

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

Supreme Soviet To Debate Gdlyan, Ivanov Case *[TASS]* 41
'Moral Condemnation' Noted *[Moscow TV]* 41
Commission Notes Power Abuse *[Moscow International]* 41
Moscow TV Carries 16 Apr Soviet of Union Session 42
Taxation of Enterprises Debated 42
'Disputed Points' of Draft Noted 43
Soviet of Nationalities Discusses Bill 43
Parliament Chambers Consider Tax Bills *[TASS]* 44
Finance Minister Presents Law *[Moscow International]* 45
Resolution on Economic Relations Law Published *[Moscow Radio]* 45
Roundup of Supreme Soviet Activities *[Moscow Radio]* 45
Committee Hearings on Ambassadorial Appointments *[PRAVDA 13 Apr]* 46

Political & Social

Law on USSR, Republic Economic Relations Published *[IZVESTIYA 17 Apr]* 46
Thousands Rally for 'Uzbek Mafia' Investigators *[AFP]* 50
Further Reportage on 21st Komsomol Congress 50
Medvedev on 'Nervous' Debate *[Moscow Radio]* 50
Background, Meaning of Party Letter Cited *[Moscow TV]* 51
CPSU Stance on Members Criticized *[TASS]* 52
Leniency on Alternative Views Urged *[TASS]* 52
Politburo Members Attend Congress *[Moscow Radio]* 53
PRAVDA's Frolov Meets Delegates *[Moscow Radio]* 53
Opening of Congress Reported *[12 Apr]* 53
Shevardnadze Signs Agreement With Science Academy *[TASS]* 54
Yanayev Elected To Head Trade Union Council *[TASS]* 54
Yeltsin on Democratic Supporters Leaving CPSU *[Moscow International]* 55
Presidential Council's Shatalin on Market Economy *[TASS]* 55
Baklanov Attends Cosmonautics Day Meeting *[PRAVDA 13 Apr]* 55
Vorontsov Questioned on Environmental Pollution *[Moscow TV]* 56
Ligachev, Others Address Veterans' Plenum *[VETERAN No 13]* 56
Democratic Platform's Shostakovskiy Cited *[UCHITELSKAYA GAZETA No 11]* 60
Democratic Platform Accused of Factionalism *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Apr]* 62
Party Apparatus' Role, Position Viewed *[PRAVDA 3 Apr]* 64
Charity To Help Child Victims of Nuclear Tests *[TASS]* 68
Moscow Hosts Roundtable on Lenin's Significance *[PRAVDA 6 Apr]* 68
Officials Sign Obituary of Musician Mark Fradkin *[PRAVDA 8 Apr]* 68
Amnesty International Chief Notes Soviet Progress *[TASS]* 68

Scientific

'Mir' Crew Conducts Routine Experiment *[Moscow Radio]* 69
'Mir' Cosmonauts Conduct Biotechnology Experiments *[Moscow International]* 69
Space Program Accomplishments, Failures Reviewed *[Moscow TV]* 69
'Ethical Problems' of Mixed Space Crews *[TASS]* 69

Military

Akhromeyev Attacks OGONEK; Defends Forces *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Apr]* 70

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Vilnius Radio Carries 17 Apr Council Session 76
Landsbergis Addresses Council 76
Reply to Gorbachev Debated 76
Deputies Continue Debate 77
Gas Company Receives Notice of Supply Reduction *[Vilnius Radio]* 77
Landsbergis, Prunskiene Cited on Economic Sanctions *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 17 Apr]* 77
Prunskiene, Purtulis Discuss Moscow's 'Ultimatum' *[Vilnius Radio]* 78
Prunskiene Notes Blockade 'Countermeasures' *[Moscow TV]* 79
Prunskiene Sends Telegram to Gorbachev *[TASS]* 80
Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Discusses 'Draft Reply' *[Moscow International]* 80
Impact of Moscow Embargo; Contacts Sought *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 17 Apr]* 80
Ozolas Reports Lithuania Could Resist Blockade *[AFP]* 81
Blockade Effects on Lithuania Discussed *[Moscow International]* 81
Lithuania's Brazauskas, Stankevicius Interviewed *[Vilnius Radio]* 82
TASS Cites U.S. Analyst on Lithuania 83
Checkpoint Official Views Border Security *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Apr]* 83
Report on Work of Lithuanian Draft Offices *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Apr]* 84
Arguments Against Geneva Convention Pleas Cited *[PRAVDA 15 Apr]* 85
Sobchak Regrets Brazauskas Nonelection *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 7 Apr]* 85
Lithuanian Union Official on Political Situation *[TRUD 6 Apr]* 87
Gosplan Deputy on Lithuanian Independence *[TRUD 10 Apr]* 89
Anti-Army Instances Noted in Lithuania *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Apr]* 92
Servicemen Attacked in Lithuania; Shots Fired *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Apr]* 92
Lithuanian Anti-Independence Rally, Appeal *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Mar]* 93
Decree Implements Lithuanian Law on Press *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 18 Feb]* 94
More on Takeover of Vilnius Publishing House *[PRAVDA 4 Apr]* 94
Lithuanian Law on Property Published *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 22 Feb]* 95
Lithuanian Control of Nuclear Safety Questioned *[TRUD 28 Mar]* 97
Ozolas Interviewed on Cultural Affairs *[EKHO LITVY 21 Mar]* 99
Legal Expert Interviewed on Lithuanian Situation *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 13 Apr]* 100
Specialist Views Lithuanian Resolutions *[TASS]* 101
Landsbergis Urges New Swedish Stance *[Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER 11 Apr]* 101
Danish Paper Cited on Sajudis 'Disinformation' *[PRAVDA 14 Apr]* 102
Commission on Eastern Lithuania Formed *[EKHO LITVY 23 Mar]* 102
National Group Poll in Vilnius Reported *[Moscow TV]* 102
Activities by Baltic 'Provocateurs' Cited *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Mar]* 103
Comparison of Gorbachev Letter to Lithuania *[PRAVDA 14 Apr]* 104
Ryuytel Discusses Conversation With Gorbachev *[Tallinn Radio]* 104
Status of Estonian Communist Party Reported *[Moscow International]* 104
Deputies Deplore Estonian Law on Military Service *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Apr]* 105
Estonian Law on Military Service Criticized *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Apr]* 105
Agenda of Estonian Supreme Soviet Viewed *[TASS]* 106
Calendar for Repeat Elections in Latvia Listed *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 24 Mar]* 106

RSFSR

Arguments Flare at 1st Moscow Soviet Meeting *[Moscow TV]* 106
Deputies Appeal on Gdlyan, Ivanonv *[Moscow Radio]* 106
Blocs Dominate New City Soviet *[IZVESTIYA 17 Apr]* 107
Mordovian Party Secretary, Deputy Expelled *[Moscow International]* 107
Baklanov, Ryabev Visit Chelyabinsk Oblast *[PRAVDA 12 Apr]* 107
Tambov City, Rayon Party Committees Abolished *[Moscow Radio]* 108
Construction of Volga Atomic Power Station Halted *[Moscow Radio]* 108
Gusev Team Probes Ufa Water Poisoning *[IZVESTIYA 14 Apr]* 108
Khabarovsk Kray Party Leader Retires *[Moscow TV]* 108
Tyumen Oil, Gas Workers' Grievances Examined *[MOSCOW NEWS No 13]* 108
Union Leader Comments *[MOSCOW NEWS No 13]* 109
Ryabov Gives Views *[MOSCOW NEWS No 13]* 110

Western Republics

Procurator's Office Examines Chernobyl Violations *[TASS]* 111
Deputies Discuss Chernobyl Aftermath *[TASS]* 112
Chernobyl Damage Estimated at $350 Billion *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 112
Ukraine Asks UN for Aid for Chernobyl Cleanup *[TASS]* 112
Chernobyl Workers Halt Hunger Strike *[TRUD 31 Mar]* 113
Ivashko Addresses Ukrainian Party Plenum *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 24 Feb]* 113
Commission on Crimean Tatars Meets *[TASS]* 115
Ukrainian Orthodox Church Issues Statement *[TASS]* 116
Lithuanian Residents Seek Belorussia Asylum *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 17 Apr]* 116
Moldavians Reiterate Need for Self-Determination *[TASS]* 116

Caucasus

Inter-Ethnic Crime Increasing in Transcaucasus *[Moscow International]* 117
Armenian Internal Affairs Ministry Issues Report *[Yerevan Radio]* 117
Armenian Party Issues Appeal on Elections *[ARMENPRES]* 117
Reports Indicate Chemical Leak Will Poison Crop *[Yerevan International]* 118
Azerbaijan Court Jails Armenian Gang Members *[PRAVDA 15 Apr]* 118
Baku Encourages Russian Refugees To Return *[IZVESTIYA 12 Apr]* 118
Mutalibov Visits Rayon Centers, Discusses Borders *[Baku Radio]* 119
Rallies Call for Georgian Independence *[Moscow International]* 119
Rustavi Metal Workers Strike Still Possible *[IZVESTIYA 14 Apr]* 119
Correction to Armenian KGB Statement *[Yerevan Radio]* 119

Central Asia

Kara-Kalpak Supreme Soviet Elects Chairman *[PRAVDA VOSTOKA 18 Mar]* 120
Uzbek Training Commission Formed *[PRAVDA VOSTOKA 15 Apr]* 120
New Business Newspaper Published in Tashkent *[Moscow TV]* 120
Anti-Nuclear Congress Planned for Kazakhstan *[TASS]* 120

Problems of Destroying Chemical Weapons Cited

LD1704084790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 17 Apr 90

[Text] For over two months now, the spring session of the conference on disarmament has been working in Geneva's Palace of Nations. At the center of attention of the participants in the talks are matters relating to the concluding phase of preparing a convention on the complete banning and destruction of chemical weapons. Most of the articles have been agreed, but the experts still have to resolve several complex problems, such as drafting rules acceptable to all countries that govern inspection and the opportunities to monitor the activity of state and private enterprises that make use of the most dangerous chemical agents. Delegations from 40 states are taking part in the work of the conference.

Alongside this, another round of Soviet-American consultations on outlawing chemical weapons has begun in Geneva. These consultations are regarded as an important component part of the conference. The head of the Soviet delegation to the disarmament conference and at the bilateral cohsultations, Sergey Batsanov, tells our correspondent about the progress of these consultations.

[Batsanov] This is the last of our working meetings with the U.S. delegation on outlawing chemical weapons before the summit in the United States. And this has determined the main talks of the round. In the first place, I should mention the preparation of a bilateral agreement between the USSR and the United States on their mutual obligations. What this involves is both sides significantly cutting their stocks of chemical weapons. And another thing: We are proposing that, within the framework of this bilateral agreement, the USSR and the United States should undertake not to produce chemical weapons.

Unfortunately, as yet the Soviet side cannot put forward any definite timetable for the start and end of the process of destroying its chemical weapons within the framework of the bilateral agreement. We had intended to set about this towards the end of last summer, or in early autumn. A facility was built for destroying chemical weapons in Chapayevka. But the local population and the local authorities, including those throughout Kuybyshev Oblast, strongly objected to this facility being engaged in the destruction of chemical weapons, largely out of considerations of ecological safety. Now we are faced with the problem of choosing sites for other facilities. The United States, which has already long been engaged in the problem of destroying its chemical weapons, has one destruction facility virtually ready, and several others nearing completion. They have officially informed us that they are prepared to help us in any way they can to build the facilities and create the necessary technology, with special emphasis on protection of the environmet. We are currently discussing these issues with the Americans.

Deterrence Seen as 'Outdated Concept'

PM1704080590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Apr 90 First Edition p 3

[Article by Candidate of Technical Sciences V. Dmitriyev and Candidate of Philosophical Sciences Colonel V. Strebkov: "Outdated Concept"]

[Text] Truly revolutionary changes are taking place in the international arena. The world's interdependence is increasing and, at the same time, the diversity in the development of different countries is more and more noticeable.

Military-political relations between East and West are changing substantially as well. An intensive search is under way for the optimum way of shaping a new security model—not through an arms buildup but through their phased reduction. It is becoming increasingly obvious that the components of a new international security system in the future will not be primarily military but above all political, economic, and humanitarian.

As the functions of the nonmilitary components of security expand, the role of the strategic nuclear element will inevitably narrow. This trend is already quite clearly visible. But since the formation of an integrated international security system is a process and, it seems, a relatively long process—the reduction of strategic nuclear forces to zero will be phased in, with the gradual inclusion in it of all states with nuclear weapons.

Which demands should the sides' strategic nuclear forces correspond to in order to provide adequate and reliable security at each stage of their reduction? This is probably one of the key questions of the new political thinking. In order to answer it, we will need, on the basis of the concept of preventing nuclear war, to determine the place of strategic nuclear forces in resolving this truly historic task.

Judging by press articles, there is no single opinion about this either in our country or abroad. Nonetheless, the idea that it is possible to solve the problem of preventing nuclear war above all by means of nuclear weapons—that is, by means of nuclear deterrence—continues to be popular. In the opinion of those who take this view, nuclear deterrence makes it possible to inflict "unacceptable damage" on an aggressor during retaliatory actions by the country under attack. This approach can quite justifiably be called the concept of the balance of terror.

The doctrine of "nuclear deterrence" became widespread in the United States back in the late forties in order to justify the development [sozdaniye] and subsequently the quantitative buildup and qualitative improvement of nuclear arms. In subsequent years U.S. theoreticians developed various versions of this doctrine. However, a number of features common to it were invariably retained: the concept of the USSR as the main enemy, the desire to achieve superiority in strategic

might, and the permissibility of the preemptive use of nuclear weapons (a first strike).

Analyzing this concept, we need to note that the now quite obviously catastrophic nature of the consequences of the use of nuclear weapons even on a limited scale virtually deprives the decision on the deliberate use of a first strike of any rational sense. All attempts to show that any level of damage from a nuclear strike can be thought acceptable cannot be considered convincing. Since any damage inflicted by nuclear weapons is unacceptable for human society.

Hence the mistakenness of the opinion still widespread among the supporters of the "nuclear deterrence" doctrine and at the core of that doctrine that there is such a thing as an "acceptable" or "unacceptable" level of damage. As is well known, this is based on the claim that the ability to deliver between several dozen and several hundred nuclear munitions to military-economic targets on enemy territory or to take out up to 60-70 percent of industry is entirely sufficient to deter any aspirations on the part of an aggressor to engage in the massive use of nuclear weapons. It is usual to call this level of damage "unacceptable." Does this mean that a lower level of damage is "acceptable"? That is absurd.

There are also serious doubts about the effectiveness of nuclear deterrence itself in a crisis based on the threat to destroy the enemy's economy. Why? Because nuclear strikes against cities and other targets in the economic structure or against military installations on one or either side will lead to their complete destruction as a result of the fatal geophysical consequences, and therefore are pointless in the political, military, or any other sense.

The orientation toward nuclear deterrence permits the possibility of considerable differences in the potential of the sides' nuclear forces. In a crisis situation these differences could encourage the use of superiority in strategic nuclear weapons to exert political and psychological pressure. After all, according to views widespread in the United States, the weaker side should give in and the size of the concessions should be directly proportional to the level of superiority. This approach would most likely result in an escalation of the conflict. All the more so as, at a certain stage of the conflict the United States—as has repeatedly been stressed by Washington administration spokesmen—permits the possibility of bringing into action the basic plan for the use of strategic nuclear forces.

We also need to bear in mind the fact that, given a sharp deterioration in the international situation and given the nuclear superiority of one of the opposing sides, the factor of the threat of devastating consequences resulting from an exchange of nuclear strikes might simply fail to work. In a crisis one of the dominant points in the past was traditionally the supposed existence of military possibilities for resolving a conflict. Now these possibilities do not exist. But we do not yet have any grounds for underestimating the tenacity of the stereotypes of prenuclear thinking.

As for our country, all the basic postulates of nuclear deterrence are unacceptable in essence to the USSR. And not only today—that was the case in the past, too. However, something else is true: We were objectively forced to respond with deterrence to the brinkmanship challenges issued by the other side. Could things have been any different in a divided world? Hardly.

The bankruptcy of the concept under examination stood out during the formation of the new model of security. Deterrence is a consequence of the cold war—that is, a condition of acute political, economic, military and ideological confrontation between states. In other words, it is precisely the result of a bipolar view of the world. The new philosophy of security proceeds on the basis of the realization of the fact that the most acute interstate contradictions are nonetheless contradictions within the framework of a united world, and they should be resolved by using civilized forms and methods rather than by force of arms—much less nuclear arms.

In our opinion, today we need to seek ways of averting war not within the framework of the obsolete deterrence strategy but by safeguarding strategic stability, which is typified by an approximate equality between gradually diminishing combat potentials of the opposing sides' strategic nuclear forces, and the priority of political means of resolving conflicts. However, that is clearly a subject for another discussion.

Soviet Forces Commander Discusses Northern Group

LD1304184590 Warsaw PAP in English
1702 GMT 13 Apr 90

[Text] Warsaw, April 13—"If there be an order, we soldiers, like in Afghanistan, will withdraw from here," said General Viktor Petrovich Dubinin, commander of the Northern Group of the Soviet Army stationed in Poland in a talk with journalists of the "Solidarnosc" weekly.

Dubinin, born in 1943, went through all levels of command. He is a graduate of the Academy of Armoured Forces and the Academy of the General Staff, and, as he himself stated, "fulfilled the internationalist duty in Afghanistan" between the years 1984 and 1987, where he was commander of the 40th Army. He took command of the Northern Group of the Soviet Army in Poland in July 1989. Since March 4 1990 he is a deputy of the Supreme Soviet. The following are some of his statements:

Task of the Northern Group

—Together with the Polish Army, the GDR People's Army, and the Western Group of the Soviet Army stationed in the GDR, we are defending the interests of the Soviet Union. The mentioned above Armed Forces represent an effective shield of the Warsaw Treaty, guarding peaceful work and development of Poland. Currently, the Northern Group, together with the Polish Army has the task to defend Poland's Western Frontier. Those troops form the second line of defence and a reserve of the basic concentration of Soviet troops stationed in Germany.

Manpower and Equipment

—The Northern Group is composed of 58 thousand men, officers, and white and blue collar employees. Officers can live together with their families. There is about nine thousand women and children here. In tune with an agreement with the Polish Government, the size of manpower of our troops may reach 62 to 66 thousand men and officers. The troops are equipped with 605 tanks, 850 armoured and combat carriers, 450 guns and mortars. There are also 220 combat planes and 85 helicopters stationed in Poland. My country made an unilateral reduction in the armed forces by 500 thousand soldiers, in frames of which it withdrew over ten thousand soldiers from Poland. We plan to decrease the number of soldiers of the Northern Group by 5.5 to 6 thousand by the end of the year to have about 50 thousand soldiers. We also intend to withdraw to the Soviet Union military equipment and ammunition stocks.

New Situation in Europe

—The changing situation in Eastern Europe caused that our government undertook the decision to withdraw Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia and Hungary. Soviet troops are to be withdrawn from Warsaw Treaty states by 1995, while all military bases outside the Soviet Union will be liquidated to the year 2000.

—Unified Germany causes concern not only in Europe but also in the United States. It is well-known who started the First and Second World Wars. People are afraid of the 4th Reich, for older ones will remember the 3rd Reich. We are of the opinion that United Germany should find itself under international supervision. We must be vigilant, for one can expect an aggression first of all against Poland. This is the reason for which Soviet troops, even after the creation of one German state, should not, temporarily, leave the GDR, although their number will be reduced. These are no longer occupying forces as in the past—as an element of the Warsaw Treaty, they have a peaceful mission to fulfil, they are a stabilizing factor maintaining peace in Europe.

Attitude Towards Perestroyka

—Our country's Armed Forces do not need perestroyka. Perestroyka is needed only in mutual relations between people, between commanders and soliders. There is a need for more democracy, openness, that is why we are staging meetings which pass opinions on officers' promotions, undertake various cadre decisions and deal with every-day problems.

—The manpower of our forces has been reduced by 500 thousand. Currently, our Army has 3 million 997 thousand soldiers. Furthere reduction of 240-250 thousand soldiers is planned for this year in result of which the Army will count about 3 million 750 thousand. The American Army is also large. It has 3 million 229 thousand soldiers.

—The role of the Communist Party was and will remain to be the most important in the Armed Forces. Up to now, no other party has been registered. All progressive initiatives came from the party: Improvement in the level of training, keeping order and discipline. That is how it was and how it is now and I hope it will continue to be like that in the Armed Forces.

Relations With Poles

—They are very good. In all places where our troops are stationed, relations with authorities and local residents are very good. Many of us have Polish friends. We would like to have the best possible contacts with the local population with Polish soldiers. That is why we regret that currently there are no posters devoted to Polish-Soviet friendship in day-rooms of the Polish units. In our day-rooms there is always a Polish flag.

—We noticed recently that Polish officers are afraid to meet with us, as if they were afraid about their careers. We want to get to know each other better, for we hope that then such demonstrations as that staged by drunken youth on the day of our Army, on February 22, when they screamed "Soviets go home," and "tanks to the Volga River" will not take place. I stood in front of them and I said: "We are soldiers. Like in Afghanistan, if an order comes, than we will withdraw from here."

Shevardnadze Briefs Press on U.S. Visit

Worldwide Issues

LD1604195990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1847 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, 16 Apr—TASS diplomatic correspondent Georgiy Shmelev reports:

The Soviet-U.S. dialogue that ended recently in Washington is an important event in foreign political life and not only of our country. That is how USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze began a briefing for Soviet journalists at the USSR Foreign Ministry. What is involved here is not only the dialogue's significance for bilateral relations between the USSR and the United States, the minister continued. It took place on the threshold of a Soviet-U.S. summit between Presidents Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush, while it seems to me that no one intends to dismiss its role and place in world politics, he noted.

A whole complex of the most important international and bilateral ties were discussed in Washington. Here I should like to pick out an extremely useful discussion on the problem of resolving regional conflicts, said the minister. The sides noted the need to utilize the full potential of Soviet-U.S. relations for the settlement of conflict situations, wherever they exist in the world. Here I would like to come back to my meetings and talks in Windhoek (where a Soviet delegation recently participated in the ceremonies whereby Namibia was declared independent), particularly with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, on matters of the national conflicts in Angola and Mozambique, and on the problem of dismantling apartheid in South Africa. The United States has certain contacts with the government of South Africa and we have certain contacts with the African National Congress and with other forces and movements in the region, which determines good prospects for our cooperation in this sphere, noted the minister.

At the meeting in Washington, he went on, the Afghan problem was also examined—a gradual "step by step" rapprochement in the positions of the sides is under way here.

Eduard Shevardnadze described as "very significant" the progress made in examining questions on reducing strategic offensive weapons and banning chemical weapons, particularly on issues of destroying the major stockpiles of these weapons. From setting limits to reducing them—such is the direction in resolving the issue of eliminating all forms of weapons, he said.

The USSR foreign minister pointed out that a great deal of attention was devoted at the Washington meeting to issues relating to the situation in Lithuania. "Everyone was asking about this problem (the Lithuanian problem);" one could sense the general concern for the situation in the world and for the state of Soviet-U.S. relations, he said. In my opinion, the minister commented, a realistic and sober approach predominated.

Replying at the briefing to a question from a TASS diplomatic correspondent on the reaction to the idea of holding a summit of NATO member countries on the issue of German unification, as suggested in Bermuda by U.S. President George Bush and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, Eduard Shevardnadze said that this decision is the natural desire of the sides to examine every aspect of the problem as a whole; however, the mechanism of the "two plus four" decision exists, and it can hardly be replaced by various sorts of meetings. The unification process, the minister opined, is not going as fast and painlessly as some people try to make out. Speaking about the visits foreign statesmen are due to make to the USSR in the next few days, Eduard Shevardnadze singled out the visits of the Italian foreign minister and the premier of the PRC State Council.

Since Mikhail Gorbachev's official visit to Italy at the end of last year, Shevardnadze said, relations beween the Soviet Union and Italy have entered a new stage and have acquired a new quality—"good trustful relations, a large sphere of agreement on many issues, and a basis for cooperation have taken shape in relations between our two countries," he stressed. This is why we attach great importance to the Italian foreign minister's visit.

Soviet-Chinese relations were normalized in Beijing last spring, the minister went on. "We regard this normalization as a vital achievement in the restructuring of international relations. We are now moving toward the practical implementation of our agreements to practical matters in our bilateral relations," the minister noted. "What I have in mind is specifically developing economic and scientific and technical cooperation, overcoming military confrontation (much has been done in this respect), solving border issues, and considering matters relating to our interaction in the Asian-Pacific region and the world as a whole," the minister stressed.

Since Mikhail Gorbachev's official visit to Italy at the end of last year, Shevardnadze said, relations beween the Soviet Union and Italy have entered a new stage and have acquired a new quality—"good trustful relations, a large sphere of agreement on many issues, and a basis for cooperation have taken shape in relations between our two countries," he stressed. This is why we attach great importance to the Italian foreign minister's visit.

Soviet-Chinese relations were normalized in Beijing last spring, the minister went on. "We regard this normalization as a vital achievement in the restructuring of international relations. We are now moving toward the practical implementation of our agreements, to practical matters in our bilateral relations," the minister noted. "What I have in mind is the specific development of economic, scientific and technical cooperation, overcoming military confrontation (much as been done in

this respect), the solution of border issues, and consideration of matters relating to our interaction in the Asian-Pacific region and the world as a whole," the minister stressed.

U.S. Relations

LD1604212890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Report by station correspondent Sergey Grachev and Andrey Sisnev on news conference by USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze at USSR Foreign Ministry on 16 April]

[Text] [Grachev] This meeting proceeded, as it is customary to say, in an informal setting. Representatives of PRAVDA, IZVESTIYA, Gosteleradio, and other mass media took the opportunity to ask questions of interest and obtain authoritative replies. The conversation was thorough and dealt with various problems in world politics. The minister shared his impressions of his recent trip to the United States and African countries, and talked about the visit—now beginning—to Moscow by the foreign minister of Italy.

[Sisnev] Now we invite you to listen to how the minister evaluated the state and prospects for Soviet-U.S. relations following his recent talks with Secretary of State Baker. Here is what he said, in particular:

[Begin Shevardnadze recording] I think, all the same, that the Washington meeting was useful. That is to say, the Americans themselves also agree with this, especially as far as bilateral relations are concerned—that was back on Malta, so to speak. So, very important and topical areas were designated. The presidents spoke about the fact that a foundation for stability must be laid. We had a very interesting conversation about this, in my opinion. Specialists and our experts were in working groups as appropriate, and half a dozen fairly major agreements are being outlined on trade, perhaps in the sphere of [word indistinct], the peaceful conquest of space, and in some other spheres—ecology—there were interesting proposals. So it is a significant package.

This time the conversation on regional problems was useful. We said in Wyoming, you still recall, that we should try to move over, so to speak, to mutual understanding and interaction: That is not just a phrase but work. We are trying in this respect, both the Americans and our side to so speak; so good prospects are opening here for interaction. On Cambodia and Afghanistan, we found more elements of mutual understanding. I will not say that our views coincide fully. Large differences still remain, especially on Afghanistan. All the same, gradually, step-by-step, our positions are coming closer together, as they are on other region issues.

As for the problems in negotiations connected with strategic offensive weapons, we also advanced on some matters: Mobile missiles, and some other problems connected with verification, verification systems, and so on. On chemical weapons the talks brought very significant proposals. I feel that during Mikhail Sergeyevich's visit we shall manage to sign a very important agreement on a bilateral basis to eliminate stocks of chemical weapons. The meeting with the president was interesting, (?I would even say) very interesting, very positive. The conversations were very substantive and embraced almost the whole range of problems that will be designated on the agenda for the summit meeting.

Then there were various estimates in the United States. There were optimistic as well as restrained estimates, but this is not the main thing. The main thing is the new area of mutual understanding, and that—regarding the question of disarmament, especially strategic offensive weapons—we have finally determined the position, and have agreed that even before Baker's arrival we will exchange letters or representatives to prepare for this visit. Well, what are we striving for? It is well known, and has been carried on from the Reykjavik [word indistinct] a 50 percent reduction with regard to strategic offensive weapons. It would be pleasant for all the [words indistinct]. To put an end to the arms race, to totally stop the arms race. [end recording]

Italian News Agency Interview

LD1604214790 Moscow World Service in English 2100 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Text] Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze has voiced the hope that the Soviet-American summit, scheduled for 30 May thru 3 June, will be crowned with concrete results. He said that a treaty on a 50 per cent reduction in strategic offensive arms was expected to be initiated before it could be signed at the end of this year. He also voiced the hope that the meeting to promote bilateral ties [sentence as heard]. Shevardnadze said the two presidents could give a mighty impetus to the talks on the reduction of conventional arms in Europe. He gave an interview to an Italian news agency in connection with the visit to this country of the Italian Foreign Minister Gianni de Michelis.

Havel Proposes U.S.-Soviet Summit in Slovakia

LD1604170990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Text] President Havel of Czechoslovakia has invited the leaders of the USSR and the United States—Gorbachev and Bush—to hold a meeting in his country on issues relating to European security. In his message to the Soviet and U.S. presidents, Havel has suggested holding this meeting, perhaps this autumn, in the Slovak mountains. As you will know, the next Soviet-U.S. summit meeting is scheduled for 30 May to 3 June in Washington.

Bush-Thatcher Talks Yield No New Ideas

LD1604192990 Moscow World Service in English 1710 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Excerpts] The recent meeting in Bermuda between the U.S. President George Bush and British Prime Minister

Mrs. Margaret Thatcher caused widespread interest, with both leaders seeing it as a preparation stage in the run-up to talks with President Gorbachev. This is what Vladislav Kozyakov writes.

President Bush is to host the Soviet leader in Washington at the end of May, and Mrs. Thatcher will be arriving in Moscow in June. So what was the outcome of talks in Bermuda between the American and British leaders? Sadly, the statements they made produced a dual impression. On the one hand both of them stated understanding of the crucial change in Europe and internationally, as well as the unprecedented opportunities now open for dialogue with the Soviet Union. [passage omitted]

However, other reports from Bermuda were less encouraging. On Lithuania, Mr. Bush was quoted as saying he agreed with the Soviet president there must be no lectures (?no issue) from other states. Nonetheless, talks in Bermuda reiterated the need for what was described as discussion and dialogue, contrary to everyone's knowledge that the internal conflict was the Soviet Union's alone, and that its president, parliament, and government are trying to resolve it in line with the country's Constitution and laws.

Although German unity and European security featured high, no new creative ideas have emerged. Soviet calls for compromise were unheeded, and the formula rejected by the Soviet Union had been restated. The two leaders had called for a unified Germany's membership of NATO and its military structures, and for NATO's nuclear strategy to be maintained even in the newly emerging conditions in Europe.

This prompts a number of questions, such as how to create a European security system involving all European countries, the U.S. and Canada; or what's to happen to the idea of the two alliances lessening their military role in favor of bigger political functions, which seems to be part of East-West understanding; or how to synchronize the European process on German unity. And finally, how to move both toward a single Western Europe and a unified Europe from the Atlantic down to the Urals.

Unfortunately, all of these were given less attention than they merit. In the meantime, the problems of building a common home in Europe, shedding military confrontations, and providing for equal security to all are urgent, but the solutions do not lie within the framework of old stereotpyes of all alliance policies. New realities place the need for new political thinking, which failed to dominate discussions on a number of issues on the agenda of the Bermuda talks.

Petrovskiy Addresses UN Conference in Japan

LD1604193790 Moscow TASS in English 1906 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Article by TASS correspondent Vladimir Kuchko; "Vladimir Petrovskiy on Consequences for Peace and Security"—TASS headline]

[Text] Sendai, Miyagi Prefecture April 16 TASS—The international conference "Tendencies in Science and Technology: Consequences for International Peace and Security" opened today in the administrative and industrial centre in the northeast of the Japanese Honshu Island. The forum, organised by the United Nations, is being attended by politicians, government representatives, scientists and experts in disarmament from twenty-two countries.

Historic changes in the world, when ideological and military confrontation in East-West relations is supplanted by political dialogue and cooperation, opens up favourable opportunities for multilateral efforts in the field of disarmament, U.N. Deputy Secretary-General Yasusi Akasi said in his opening address of the conference.

Broad international scientific and technical cooperation as well as joint steps aimed at averting the use of high technologies for the creation of new kinds of armaments can become an important contribution to strengthening global security and stability, he pointed out.

In an epoch of radical shifts in the world in the beginning of the collective construction of a new, post-confrontational world, the role and place of scientific and technical progress in the search for ways to strengthen security must be reconsidered in-depth, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy told the conference.

The world community is in need of a policy aimed at demilitarising international relations and enabling nations to switch resources over to peaceful and creative development. Over recent years a long distance has been covered, taking mankind away from the abyss of nuclear destruction. A new quality has been acquired by talks on strategic weapons, on a chemical weapons ban and on conventional forces in Europe. Verification and openness are becoming inalienable accompanying measures.

In this context, tasks arise to ensure the continuity of disarmament processes, as well as their globalisation and the involvement of all states in the process, the Soviet delegation head noted. Processes of reducing military confrontation which have begun in Europe are consonant with security in Asia. Our Euro-Asian country might become a link between the two continents in this respect.

The Soviet Union regards working out measures to control the use of scientific and technological achievements for military purposes as a major independent direction in the military-political field, Petrovskiy noted. It is inadmissible that while some categories of arms are being reduced and eliminated, new quality arms are replacing them. The Soviet Union, India and some other states have advanced a number of ideas aimed at preventing the use of new technologies for the creation of new weapons, he said.

In the present interdependent world, security is made up not only of military components but also of economic and ecological ones, Petrovskiy noted. The significance of cooperation, agreements and mutual enrichment of

scientific andf technological efforts of various countries is increasing. This is especially expedient, taking into account the new global challenges to humanity advanced by the present epoch.

The solution of an entire range of issues, including power supplies with the help of thermo-nuclear reactors and the normalisation of the environment, is hardly possible for single nation. It is too expensive and sometimes simply impossible.

"As regards the Soviet Union it is firmly oriented towards the integration of its economy in the world system and is prepared to expand and mutually-enrich exchanges and contacts in the field of science and technology and to merge, where necessary, our talents with others' skills in organisation and management. At the same time our country cannot ignore the fact that such exchanges are still regarded in the West through the prism of force stereotypes and the desire to ensure scientific and technical supremacy in the military field," Petrovskiy stressed.

Until recently the Berlin Wall was regarded as the main symbol of the ideological division of the world, a barrier of this kind still exists in the field of scientific knowledge. This barrier is Cocom.

"Discrimination in the field of contacts and high-technology exchanges can hardly be seen as consistent with present realities. International trade and cooperation should not be hampered by high thresholds and closed doors. If our partners fear the technological exchanges may be used for military purposes, the Soviet Union is prepared to look for ways to dispel these fears. We favour a prompt beginning of East-West consultations on the rules of transfer of the double-purpose technologies, envisaging, where necessary, the procedure for verifying its use after the purchase," the Soviet deputy foreign minister said.

Discussing ecological problems, Petrovskiy stressed that universal efforts are required to resolve them, national potentials should be added up for the purpose.

The attention of conference participants was drawn to the idea of a new, strategic ecological initiative—SEI. It proposes to pool, within the framework of a single super-project on an international basis, the potential of the best minds mankind has, and to concentrate resources to develop perfect technological solutions. In this connection the Soviet readiness was reiterated to promote Soviet-Japanese cooperation in the ecological field, including the opening of the Kuril Islands and the Sakhalin for these purposes and turning them into a common testing ground for joint efforts in the sphere of environmental protection.

Frolov Receives Visiting Academics

PM1604124990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Apr 90 Second Edition p 4

[Unattributed report under general heading: "PRAVDA's Guests"]

[Text] M. Kaplan and G. Anderson, president and general secretary of the World Professors Academy, visited the PRAVDA editorial office. Problems of perestroyka in the USSR and the role of science in the modern world were discussed in conversation with I.T. Frolov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chief editor of PRAVDA.

Frolov Meets With Austria's Zdenek Mlynar

PM1604125990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Apr 90 Second Edition p 4

[L. Chausov report under general heading "PRAVDA's Guests": "Zdenek Mlynar: 'A Frank Discussion Is Needed...'"]

[Excerpt] Z. Mlynar, well-known scientist, one of the prominent figures of the "Prague Spring," and now a professor at Innsbruck University (Austria), visited our newspaper's editorial office 11 April. He was received by I.T. Frolov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chief editor of PRAVDA. During talks there was an exchange of opinions on urgent questions connected with the theory and practice of the processes of renewal, with the progress of perestroyka, and with the party's role in the democratization of society. [passage omitted]

People's Labor Union Member Interviewed

90UF0052A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 14, 7-13 Apr 90 p 4

[Interview with B. Miller, council member of the People's Labor Union, by P. Lukyanchenko in Paris; date not given: "The Same NTS"]

[Text] **Terrorists professing brutish anti-Sovietism, fascist rabble embodying the ideas of brainless Vlasovite bandits, fugitive fighters against communism with the chummiest relations with the Gestapo, inveterate scoundrels squandering money from British special services in pubs—this is the way the well-known Soviet historian N. Yakovlev, author of the book "The CIA Against the USSR," another edition of which came out in 1985, describes the activists of the People's Labor Union.**

For the sake of objectivity we decided to listen to the other side's arguments. To this end, our correspondent P. Lukyanchenko met in Paris with a member of the NTS [People's Labor Union] Council, B. Miller.

[Miller] The People's Labor Union of proponents of Russian solidarity has been the only serious and organized force which, beginning in 1930, has fought the Stalinist regime with all available means. This is the only way to

explain the war not for life, but for death which the authorities and their repressive organs declared against us.

[Lukyanchenko] But still you will not try to deny that the NTS is an organization that is anti-Soviet in spirit.

[Miller] In general I am against the prefix "anti" because there is something unconstructive about it. Yes, we are against the system which today is still being protected by the CPSU apparatus. In the age of glasnost proclaimed by M.S. Gorbachev you learned what we have known all along: During the first 40 years of Soviet power, the attempt to impose a communist utopia on Russia has cost the people from 45 to 60 million lives, and more than 10 million of the most capable and enterprising peasants were ruined in the age of collectivization.

And yet the beginning of the 20th century was for Russia a time of advancement in all areas of life. The country had overcome its economic backwardness and social contradictions. Had it not been for the October Revolution, by the forties Russia would have far surpassed the level achieved under Stalin at the price of incredible sacrifices.

[Lukyanchenko] Nobody today can say what might have been. And it is probably not for the NTS to speak about this, the more so since, according to the information in the aforementioned book by Yakovlev, the members of your organization selected terror as the main method of "fighting against the Soviets," which is far from constructive.

[Miller] That is a lie from beginning to end. The NTS never called for terror. Our people, who crossed the Russian border over the "green road," brought with them not explosives but leaflets. That same Yakovlev in his treatise could not name a single terrorist act perpetrated by members of the NTS.

I must say to you that I entered the NTS precisely because, unlike other emigrant organizations, it did not include people who were embittered against their nation. And there could be none: The principle of solidarity which we proclaim is an appeal for the unification of all forces of the nation in the name of the homeland and not the other way around.

[Lukyanchenko] But your words differ from the statements of NTS member Ye. Divnich: "For many years I burned with hatred for everything Soviet.... Everything positive I learned about the Soviet system I let run off me like water off a duck's back.... I adopted the rule..., I would wake up in the morning and think about what harm I could do to the Soviet authorities and in the evening I would total up the results.... When a day had brought nothing I... would shake my emaciated fist, make a puny threat, and furtively make an obscene gesture...."

[Miller] If I have understood you correctly, you have in mind the book "The NTS—It Is Time For Us to Have It Out" published in New York in 1969. Here is the story behind this falsehood. Soon after the war, Divnich was taken by NKGB men on the territory of Yugoslavia and sent back to the USSR. And the book was "compiled" on the basis of interrogation notes after Divnich was already dead. And I think you have heard about how they interrogated people in Lubyanka.

[Lukyanchenko] Are you trying to say that the New York newspaper RUSSKIY GOLOS was lying when it said: "One of the NTS leaders, Okolovich, during the war years...headed a group of Gestapo provocateurs..." (I quote from Yakovlev's book). Perhaps you want to deny the fact that the NTS was in the service of the fascist occupation troops.

[Miller] Yes, I will deny that. Because 200 people—including almost all of the NTS leadership—were arrested by the Gestapo. Fifty-four of them were exterminated in concentration camps. And the organization itself was prohibited. Why? Because, although we were against the Bolshevist dictatorship, we were also against Hitler's "new order."

Those same few who remained free cooperated with the fascists and tried to find a common language with the Vlasovites. In the USSR they still have a poor idea of who the "traitor to Russia," General Vlasov was. Just as we know almost nothing about the fact that tens of thousands of Soviet people followed Vlasov, bringing down on themselves and those close to them all of the heavy blow of the hand of the "leader of nations."

If we return to RUSSKIY GOLOS, I seem to recall that such a newspaper did exist in New York at one time.

[Lukyanchenko] Excuse me but you certainly cannot deny the fact of the cooperation between the NTS and the British "intelligence service." I have in mind the text published in Yakovlev's book, the "Draft of the Declaration to the NTS Leadership," which was prepared by workers of this special service in 1956. In the document it says in particular: "The British intelligence service always told the NTS leadership that the goal pursued in their joint operations with the NTS was to obtain secret information about the USSR.... The British think that a seven-year period is quite enough to sum up the results of their work.... They have come to the conclusion that this work was very unproductive."

[Miller] It would be naive to assume that an organization such as ours in the West could escape the attention of such services as the "Intelligence Service" or the CIA. But I think that even from the text of the document you quoted (whose authenticity I seriously question) it is clear that attempts to obtain with our help secret information that would harm Russia failed. Even if they were to make very financially tempting offers but insist on their politically unacceptable conditions, we could never have agreed to do business with them with a clear conscience. Under the same conditions when NTS members begin to work for Western intelligence we immediately expel them from our ranks. This is what happened, for instance, with K. Cherezov who, as it turned out, was an agent for the West German special services.

The Americans offered to publicize our materials through "Radio Liberty" in exchange for "closer" cooperation and support for the idea of independence for the Ukraine and Belorussia. But we refused, even though we were experiencing difficulties in disseminating our ideas on the territory of Russia.

[Lukyanchenko] But what did you want? For in addition to ousting the CPSU you were working to spread fascist ideology among us, as N. Yakovlev writes.

[Miller] That is slander. (Incidentally, it is possible to judge the quality of the book from the fact that in it A.I. Solzhenitsyn is called nothing other than a "true servant of the CIA" and Academician A.D. Sakharov, a "spiritual renegade and anti-Soviet.") We were never fascists. From the very name of our organization it follows that the NTS sees Russia's future as being restored on the basis of popular will, free labor, and solidarity of all nationalities and segments of the population. Our ideology is a projection of Christianity in social life. And we try to find in people not what separates them but, on the contrary, what joins them together. We are in favor of the regeneration of Russia on the basis of Russian patriotism (but not Pamyat chauvinism), strict rule of law, private property, and freedom of personal creativity.

FROM THE EDITORS. We do not think that this interview shed enough light on the real face of the NTS. Therefore the editors are prepared to publish facts that were outside the framework of this interview.

Restored U.S. Presence at Cam Ranh Bay Possible

PM1704091990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Correspondent G. Charodeyev report: "United States Returning to Cam Ranh Bay?"]

[Excerpts] USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center—Western news agencies have reported that officials in Vietnam allegedly told U.S. representatives at a seminar in Indonesia about the possibility of restoring the U.S. military presence in Cam Ranh Bay. Yu. Gremitskikh, first deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration, who spoke at the briefing, made the following comment on that report:

"Cam Ranh is the SRV's sovereign territory and, in our opinion, this question falls within the competence of the Vietnamese authorities...." [passage omitted]

IZVESTIYA's correspondent asked a question about that part of a recent statement by Egyptian President H. Mubarak in which he said that he will visit the Soviet Union in May this year.

"As is known," the briefer replied, "the president of the Arab Republic of Egypt does indeed have an invitation to pay an official visit to our country. As for its specific timing, as far as I know, this is still being agreed upon."

Reasons for Ambassadorial Shakeup Explained

PM1704085790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Own diplomatic correspondent M. Yusin article: "New Soviet Ambassadors. What Was the Reason for the Changes in the Diplomatic Corps"]

[Text] As reported earlier, the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee has approved the candidacies of Soviet ambassadors to 10 countries. Yu.M. Vorontsov, who held the post of first deputy minister, has been appointed permanent representative to the United Nations. A.A. Bessmertnykh, also a first deputy, will depart for Washington, where he will replace Yu.V. Dubinin, who has been appointed ambassador to France. Two more former deputy ministers, I.P. Aboimov and A.L. Adamishin, are being posted to Hungary and Italy respectively. Ambassador at large Yu.B. Kashlev, a specialist in humanitarian questions and human rights, is going to Warsaw. F.P. Bogdanov, ambassador to Belgium, will depart for Bucharest. B.D. Pankin, ambassador to Sweden, will move to Czechoslovakia, while G.S. Shikin is going from Austria to the GDR. V.P. Terekhov has been appointed ambassador in Bonn.

What is behind the new appointments, why has the ambassadorial switch-around been carried out at precisely this moment and in precisely these countries. Replying to our correspondent's question, a Ministry of Foreign Affairs spokesman said that a need had arisen in the Foreign Ministry of late to regroup forces, deploy them more rationally, and bring them into line with present-day tasks. Since the situation in the world, and especially in Europe, has changed radically, the ministry has decided to keep up with the changes and renew the ambassadorial staff, introducing competent people who think along modern lines. All the countries where ambassadors are being replaced—the United States, France, Italy, East European states—currently play a key role in international life and in our foreign policy.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has no complaints against any of the former ambassadors. However, no matter how irreproachable in professional terms an official is, once he has been in the same post for four or five years he loses the edge of his perceptiveness. The optimum period of service in one and the same post is three years as a maximum. In this way the necessary dynamism is maintained and the pace of work does not decelerate.

Now there is another aspect which cannot but attract attention. It is perfectly obvious that the reshuffle which has been carried out at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is not an ordinary replacement of personnel. In a whole series of embassies professional diplomats are moving into posts previously held by former party or economic functionaries. It is to be hoped that this promising trend will be maintained and reinforced.

This applies above all to the European countries which we used to describe as socialist countries only a few years ago. While in the past it was deemed that a party secretary or an enterprise director could act as ambassador to these states, the approach has now changed. This is why people with experience of work in parliamentary, democratic countries who are familiar with the Western political system have been appointed to Eastern Europe. I.P. Aboimov is somewhat of an exception in this respect. As distinct from the others, he has not worked in the West. However, he has another advantage: Aboimov is an expert on Hungary who speaks Hungarian fluently. This is a great rarity. For the first time there will be a Soviet ambassador in Budapest who knows the language. Apart from this, having worked in Hungary a few years ago as envoy, Aboimov formed close personal contacts with leaders of youth and informal organizations—those whom the Hungarian authorities at the time classed as dissidents. Now these people have won in the elections and taken over the leadership of the country....

In connection with the announced appointments, the following question has arisen: What will be the fate of the former ambassadors who came to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs from economic and party posts at the time? Will they remain in the ministry apparatus? This refers above all to Tyazhelnikov (Romania), Brovikov (Poland), Stukalin (Hungary), Lomakin (Czechoslovakia), and Ryabov (France). The Foreign Ministry spokesman intimated that most of these people are of pensionable age and will most probably retire from active diplomatic service. Some of them may continue to work within the ministry's system for a certain period of time.

Readers will have probably noticed that as a result of the new appointments the foreign minister has lost four of his deputies at once. Who will take their place? Judging by appearances, A.M. Belonogov, permanent representative at the United Nations, will be appointed to one of the deputy minister posts. During his time at the United Nations Belonogov met envoys from dozens of countries every day, he has a keener, more up-to-date perception of the processes taking place in the world than those who work in Moscow. People at the ministry believe that the arrival of this man at Smolenskaya Ploshchad [Foreign Ministry address] will bring a breath of fresh air into the work of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

In all likelihood Yu.A. Kvitsinskiy, the Bonn ambassador, will be appointed to another deputy minister post. He will be in charge of Europe. Incidentally, this is a new element in the ministry's practice. In the past two deputy ministers were in charge of Europe—one was responsible for socialist countries, the other for the remainder. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is currently reorganizing its structure in line with the changed international situation. Europe has de facto become one. And so one person will henceforth be responsible for it at the ministry.

The opinion has been voiced that Brovikov, ambassador to Poland, has been relieved because he criticized Gorbachev at recent Central Committee plenums. The ministry spokesman categorically rejected this allegation. According to his words, Brovikov himself asked to be allowed to retire because of serious ill health. As for his professional conduct, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has no complaints about his work. Any person, even an ambassador, may have any views he likes; this is no cause for dismissal.

In conclusion a few words about the ambassadors who have not been mentioned yet.... What is the explanation for the appointment to Rome of Deputy Minister A.L. Adamishin? The point is that N.M. Lunkov, Soviet ambassador to Italy, is over 70. The time has come to think about a replacement. Especially since Italy is assuming a prominent place in world politics of late—an active, dynamic ambassador is needed there.

V.P. Terekhov, who is being sent to Bonn, is a professional diplomat and a specialist in German studies who speaks German. He has worked as envoy in the FRG in the past. G.S. Shikin, who is moving from Vienna to Berlin, is also a "skilled German hand," a specialist on the German question. F.P. Bogdanov, who has been appointed to Romania, has dealt with this country in the past, and this weighed heavily in his favor during the choice of his candidacy. And, finally, Yu.V. Dubinin, who will take up his post in Paris. He is a classical "French hand," has worked in Paris in the past, and has a sound knowledge of the language....

West's Approach to European Security Criticized

'Unconstructive' View

PM1604123990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Apr 90 First Edition p 3

[Colonel V. Markushin article: "Why Not Without an Atlantic Emphasis?"]

[Text] What should the system of collective security in Europe be like? This question greatly exercises social and scientific thought today. The new form of international order, in which the European peoples would live without any fear as regards their peaceful future, is experiencing birth pangs, so to speak. Yesterday's ideas, which fetter the intellect, are getting in the way. Consequently, certain dubious and eclectic ideas come to the surface at times.

Like, for example, a concept which has emerged in the British press. It proposes three main pillars as the foundation of security. First, the CSCE functioning as an arbiter. Second, NATO with a substantial cut in U.S. military participation. Third, a "forward line" comprising the East European countries firmly bound to the West.

What follows from this construction? They are trying to make the "Atlantic element" a special category in the

all-European process and, at the same time, to separate the USSR from this process. This approach is unconstructive, to say the least. It leaves out the most basic idea—the idea of eliminating military confrontation in Europe. Meanwhile it is right now, in the conditions of the upcoming [gryadushcheye] unification of the two German states, that a significant step can be made on the path to overcoming this confrontation. We need only to stop clinging to the bloc stereotype and look at a qualitatively different form of collective security—without blocs.

Yes, this does contradict what is persistently being suggested by the West—the unconditional preservation of NATO. But the other side has clearly defined its position as a participant in building a common Europe. But where is the way out? One answer obviously suggests itself: We must seek a compromise. And, it seems, our partners must free themselves from an excessively Atlantic emphasis in the process of discussing the details of building the European edifice.

'Unacceptable' Decision

PM1704100190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Apr 90 First Edition p 3

[Article by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA observer Vasiliy Pustov under the rubric "The World Today: Problems and Opinions": "What Form Should a United Germany Take?"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] The reaction in the United States to the events in Europe is ambivalent. Some circles even question Washington's ability to continue to play the role of NATO leader. First, because the burden of leadership, which entails a 50 percent contribution to all of the bloc's expenditure, is becoming increasingly heavy and increasingly difficult to back up with material and financial resources. Second, because the West Europeans themselves are increasingly actively expressing their dissatisfaction with U.S. leadership. Washington's task, the U.S. newspaper INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE has stressed, is to step down gracefully from its role as leader and become an equal partner.

The U.S. Administration has a different opinion on this score. It too has promised to "work for a new Europe," of course, but it certainly is not showing willing to forego its interests in the region. Washington believes that the most important guarantee of the defense of these interests is to preserve NATO and its military organization as the main buttress of virtually the whole of Western global policy. The United States makes no secret of its intention to work to strengthen the bloc.

However, it is clearly speculating on the Europeans' legitimate fears. It is trying to persuade them that U.S. military might in Europe, which cements the NATO bloc together, coupled with its traditional anti-Soviet functions is designed to counteract the formation of a dangerous military potential by a united Germany. As if no one realizes that overtures like these marry ill, to put it mildly, with the U.S. approach to defining the military-political status of the Germany of the future and with its attempts to give it a key role in NATO.

The Soviet Union has made it perfectly clear that Washington's proposed NATO membership for a united Germany is unacceptable to our country. In particular, it could cause extremely undesirable concern in Soviet society. Different options must be sought which will reliably safeguard the security of all European countries. The idea of dual membership for a united Germany, i.e. membership of NATO and the Warsaw Pact—an idea that has not gone unnoticed by Western observers—deserves attention, for example. A united Germany must have the same commitment to the Soviet Union and East European countries as to the United States and other NATO members.

The solution to the problem lies in synchronizing the formation of a united Germany with the positive development of the all-European process. This will be made possible by forming new security structures for the whole of Europe: from the Atlantic to the Urals. Incidentally, the Soviet Union is displaying a constructive approach in this respect by emphasizing the importance of U.S. involvement in the European process. The formation of effective all-European security structures means ending military confrontation on the continent and transforming military-political alliances into political-military alliances, with the subsequent development of nonbloc collective security and the adoption of other important measures.

Our Western partners must be aware of everything new that has appeared in the course of perestroyka in the USSR and also of the considerations that determine the stance it takes. In conditions where radical political reform has created the most politically-minded society in the modern world, the Soviet people now have much greater control over the activity of state power, including the USSR Supreme Soviet, which has the prerogative to ratify highly important international acts. There is no doubt that our people would reject any decision that would upset the present strategic balance in Europe and give the other side military advantages. This factor must be taken into account when deciding the German question and other questions relating to the situation in Europe. Any approach which failed to take account of our country's fundamental interests could jeopardize everything positive achieved with great difficulty on the European continent.

U.S. Trade Policy Toward China Reviewed

OW1504121690 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 15 Apr 90

[Lebedev commentary from the "Current Event and Commentaries" program]

[Text] Although the United States has declared that it gives China most-favored-nation [MFN] treatment,

regretfully it does not take a serious attitude in implementing with concrete actions the principle of no trade discrimination, said Xiao Zhiming, spokesman of the China Council for the Promotion of International Trade in Beijing. Our commentator Lebedev has the following comments on this:

If we look into some of the trade statistics, it will be easier to understand Beijing's great anxiety over the trade protectionism imposed by the United States and West European countries against China. For a start, China imported $7 billion worth of goods from the United States during the first 11 months last year, while its exports to the United States for the same period were only valued at $3.8 billion. This means that China had a $3.2 billion unfavorable trade balance. A similar unfavorable situation also exists in China's trade with members of the European Community. This is why Xiao Zhiming has said that the great trade deficit amounts existing in China's economic and trade relations with the United States and Western European countries still have an adverse effect on further development of relations with these countries. This is by no means accidental.

Here I wish to point out another reason for the dark cloud shrouding Sino-U.S. trade—the U.S. guarantee for giving China most-favored-nation treatment in terms of the lowest tariff on Chinese goods supplied to the United States will expire on 2 June this year. Although U.S. Government personnel now say that President Bush will try to extend the period of such treatment given to China, many U.S. congressmen object to this extension. Up to now, the U.S. Congress has received at least six bills proposing that China's most-favored-nation treatment be tentatively suspended or that no such treatment be granted at all.

In this connection, I would like to bring to remembrance that the sanctions Washington imposed on U.S.-Chinese trade in the wake of the Tiananmen incident in Beijing last June are still valid. Yet many political observers say that the attempt to isolate China is not only unwise but also unfeasible. As Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen has said recently in answer to a reporter's question, China's strategic position and great potential are objective realities, which the Western countries have to take seriously. China will not change its open policy and close the door it has opened; at the same time, it hopes that other countries will not close their doors to China, stressed the Chinese foreign minister.

UN Transnational Corporation Commission Meets

LD1304091790 Moscow TASS in in English 0753 GMT 13 Apr 90

[By TASS correspondent Nikolay Maslov]

[Text] New York April 13 TASS—The 16th session of the United Nations Transnational Corporation Commission has ended at the UN headquarters here. It discussed the latest changes in the activities of transnational corporations and international economic relations, environmental problems, and also the strengthening of the positions of developing countries through negotiations with them.

The session devoted particular attention to the elaboration of a code of behaviour for transnational corporations, work on which has continued for more than ten years.

"The transnational corporations have never been such an integrated force, embracing practically all types of international economic relations," Soviet delegate Valentin Shchetinin said during the draft's discussion. "Elaboration of a platform in the form of a code of behaviour for transnational corporations will make it possible to draw them into the global effort to ensure universal progress, including in developing countries."

The session's documents describe as historic the steps taken by the Soviet Union, several East European countries and China to open up their economies for a controlled influx of direct foreign investments. These countries are beginning to be not only importers, but exporters of capital. As many as 862 subsidiaries of enterprises with headquarters in East European countries and in the USSR operated on the world market this year. Some 579 of them were active in industrially developed states, primarily in West Europe.

The speakers stressed, however, that world flows of capital continue to converge on developed countries, which not only export, but also import it. As a result of this, 97.9 per cent of direct investments from five major exporters of capital were channeled to developed states in the recent five years, and only slightly more than two per cent—to developing nations. This is why some of the latter feel threatened by the reforming socialist states, some participants stressed.

The Soviet delegation explained the situation in detail, noting that perestroyka in the USSR will further stimulate the development of equitable cooperation. The resolution approved on the initiative of the Group of 77 contained no such "apprehensions."

The session condemned by a majority vote Britain's and Hungary's steps to liberalise relations with the apartheid regime in South Africa. Canada, France, West Germany, Italy, Japan, Holland, Norway, the United States, Switzerland, and Britain voted against this resolution. Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Zaire abstained. The delegates endorsed the agenda of the next session of the commission, which includes problems of the operation of transnationals in South Africa and their influence on the environment.

On the whole, the atmosphere of the session, as shown by its final documents, proves that new political thinking is making headway in the United Nations.

United States & Canada

TASS Analyst Views Dole's Baltic Aid Remarks

LD1604171390 Moscow TASS in English 1646 GMT 16 Apr 90

[By TASS political analyst Yuriy Kornilov]

[Text] Moscow April 16 TASS—Senate republican minority leader Robert Dole appealed for financial aid to Lithuania in a televised address and said that the United States could issue credits to Lithuania. He also added that the United States could also offer aid to some others—Latvia, Estonia, Georgia and Azerbaijan.

This statement compels me to remind the respected senator of the following:

Clearly expressed separatist tendencies do exist in Lithuania. However, today Lithuania (as well as Latvia, Estonia, Georgia and Azerbaijan) is an inalienable part of the Soviet Union, one of the union republics and components of the country as a whole. In this context the proposal to issue credits to a constituent republic of a sovereign state, while ignoring this state, sounds strange, doesn't it? How would Washington react if another country would seek to influence Texas or Alaska economically for its selfish political ends?

These questions are clearly rhetorical. Senator Dole, an experienced politician, must be well aware that his initiative does not fit into the frameworks of normal inter-state relations. If he, nevertheless, advances this initiative, he obviously pursues one goal—to encourage secessionists and nationalists who are pressing for the actual dislocation of the Soviet Union and to boost their activity which is often unlawful and unconstitutional in nature.

Unfortunately, Senator Dole is not alone—outbursts of secessionism in a number of Soviet regions are clearly to the liking of some people in the United States, people who are not interested in the positive development of Soviet-American relations. It is impossible to overlook the fact that some people in the United States are insistently trying to link the Lithuania issue with the Soviet-U.S. summit due to be held at the end of May. The more noise is being made around the Lithuania issue, the more officials and the press stress that no great hopes should be pinned on the forthcoming summit.

All this cannot but make the Soviet and American public increasingly anxious. According to a NEWSWEEK poll, two-thirds of American citizens are confident that "the preservation of good relations with the Soviet Union are more important for the United States than the protection of Lithuania's secessionist interests in its conflict with the Soviet Union. And this is the way it is in fact: Americans are not less than Soviet citizens interested in the positive development of relations between our two countries, in the success of the forthcoming summit meeting, and in the resolution of pressing issues, above all the disarmament problem. [no end quotation marks received]

With all this in mind, what are those driving at who, like Senator Dole, seek to pour more oil on the flames of secessionist outbursts in the Soviet Union?

Shevardnadze Receives Former Senator Gary Hart

LD1604160290 Moscow TASS in English 1559 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 16 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the USSR Presidential Council, today received Gary Hart, former U.S. Senator, a prominent politician, at the latter's request.

Soviet-U.S. relations and world political problems of mutual concern were discussed during a constructive and business-like meeting.

They spoke of the course and main directions of perestroyka in the Soviet Union and discussed prospects for mutually-beneficial business cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States in trade and economic field. Specifically a project to develop an optical fibre communications line which would link the European Continent, the Soviet Union and Asian countries.

More on Senator Mitchell's Moscow News Conference

PM1604151990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Apr 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under general heading "U.S. Senators' Visit"]

[Text] Mutual satisfaction with the transition from mutual understanding to collaboration, which has begun in the Soviet-U.S. dialogue, was expressed during a meeting with the U.S. Senate delegation at the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee which took place on the same day [12 April].

Committee Chairman A.S. Dzasokhov briefed the guests on the USSR Supreme Soviet's international ties and the plans for the committee's activities.

Arms control was one of the key topics during our interesting and informative meetings in Leningrad and Moscow, above all with USSR President M.S. Gorbachev, G. Mitchell said at a press conference held in the evening.

Since, in accordance with the U.S. Constitution, the Senate must ratify all treaties, we are vitally interested in the state of the talks on this problem which is of great importance for the peoples of our two countries and the world as a whole, he said. We welcome the determination of the Soviet side to strive for sufficient progress to be achieved to ensure the initialling of the agreement on the reduction of strategic offensive arms during the upcoming Soviet-U.S. summit, and its signing before the end of the year.

Touching upon the situation in Lithuania, the senator noted that he welcomes the intention of the president to resolve this question by peaceful, nonviolent means. He emphasized that people in the United States value the good relations which have developed between our two countries of late and expressed the hope that trade and economic ties between the USSR and the United States will be expanded for the common good. According to his opinion, any actions capable of reversing this progress would be regrettable.

Cheney, Fitzwater on Arms Control, Summit Agenda

PM1104153390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Ending Decades of Hostility"]

[Text] Washington, 10 Apr—A vigorous discussion about Soviet-American relations and the process of the changes taking place in the USSR is currently in progress in U.S. political circles. It received renewed impetus as a result of the Soviet foreign minister's recent talks in Washington.

Speaking Monday in Colorado Springs (Colorado State), U.S. Defense Secretary Richard Cheney described as "absolutely phenomenal" the changes taking place in the international situation, which, in his words, represent a unique "watershed between what went before and what comes next."

Noting the substantial democratic transformations in the Soviet Union and East European states, the defense secretary particularly singled out the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, the unilateral force and arms reductions announced by M.S. Gorbachev in December 1988, the recent agreements on withdrawing Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia and Hungary, the reduction in Soviet defense spending, the substantial progress at the Vienna conventional arms reduction talks, and also "the Soviet Union's manifest desire to end decades of hostility."

The "substantial cuts" in American military expenditure planned by the Pentagon can be seen as the "American response" to the changes taking place in the Soviet Union and the East European countries, the defense secretary stated. In this connection Cheney announced that he has received instructions from U.S. President G. Bush to prepare cuts in the U.S. military budget totaling $231 billion over the next five years so that defense appropriations in 1995 will total 21 percent of all federal expenditure, or no more than four percent of the country's gross national product. The Pentagon head noted that during the years of the Reagan administration defense appropriations totaled 27 percent of all federal expenditure or six percent of U.S. GNP.

At the same time, citing "the modernization of Soviet strategic weapons," the defense secretary spoke about the need for the United States to have substantial armed forces and to maintain the American military-industrial infrastructure, scientific research in the military sphere, and "the potential to produce modern arms based on new technologies." Cheney particularly stressed the administration's intention to continue to implement the "Strategic Defense Initiative."

At a regular White House briefing the same day Press Secretary Marlin Fitzwater answered a number of questions on the administration's assessment of the results of the recent talks between U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker and USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze. He was asked in particular whether a strategic offensive arms reduction treaty will be ready for signing by the time of the summit. The White House press secretary said: "It is doubtful that the task of preparing such a treaty is feasible for us." "I do not wish to be overpessimistic," he continued, "since another ministerial meeting has yet to be held in May in Moscow. In addition, our delegations are continuing their talks in Geneva, and we hope that we will be able to make progress on certain questions."

In setting the summit date, the press secretary stated, "we proceeded on the basis that we have many other questions to discuss in addition to arms control. We have five 'baskets,' and we are prepared to conduct the summit irrespective of what happens in the arms control 'basket'... We have always considered and still consider that summits require preparation, that they must be productive, that they must produce a positive result. But we have long since passed the point where meetings can be held only if the sides have a treaty to sign."

"I hope," M. Fitzwater went on to note, "that all subsequent summits will reflect the new elements in Soviet-American relations. We have many common questions for discussion."

Decision To Declassify Stealth Fighter Viewed

PM1104142190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Apr 90 Second Edition p 7

[Own correspondent V. Sukhoy dispatch: "Secret No More"]

[Text] New York, 7 Apr—The U.S. Defense Department has made a decision, unexpected to many, to declassify the F-117A fighter manufactured using Stealth technology.

Why did the Pentagon decide to declassify the Stealth fighter right now? The American press is making many guesses on this score. One of them deserves special attention. The Defense Department is trying to prove to one and all that Stealth technology is very effective and promising. This is being done at a time when passions are raging on Capitol Hill over the B-2 strategic Stealth bomber. Many legislators are urging the scrapping of this expensive brainchild of the Northrop concern (a B-2 costs over $500 million), and at the same time the scrapping of the whole fanciful venture of producing

supermodern aircraft which will be completely "invisible" on enemy radar screens. Minds must be changed before it is too late and the money used for something else...

Alaskan Businessman on Cooperation Prospects

PM1204101590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4

[S. Mushkaterov report: "Alaskan Businessmen in USSR"]

[Text] The first delegation of Alaskan business circles has spent more than two weeks in our country at the invitation of the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the the American-Soviet Trade and Economic Council.

Specific accords were reached during the trip, and protocols were signed on the development of cooperation, particularly in the spheres of aviation, tourism, communications, and telecommunications. Shortly before the delegation's departure from Moscow IZVESTIYA's correspondent met with one of its leaders—George Kruz [surname as transliterated], president of the Alaska Chamber of Commerce—and asked him to talk about the aims and results of the trip.

"Our delegation consisted of 50 people, 40 of them from the state of Alaska and the rest from certain other cities in the United States and also Canada. We visited Anadyr, Magadan, Khabarovsk, and Irkutsk, and then part of our delegation came to Moscow. One of our chief aims was to familiarize ourselves and make contacts with those people with whom we would like to begin business cooperation. I believe that we succeeded in doing this. We had a number of interesting meetings and important talks both in the provinces and in Moscow."

"What, in your view, are the most promising spheres in the development of business ties between Alaska and our Far Eastern and Siberian regions?"

"I would single out three spheres. Our business partnership could develop at the fastest pace in the sphere of air tourism and also transport. It will take somewhat longer to develop cooperation in mineral extraction. But I believe that this, too, will come about in the end."

U.S., Philippines Make Date for Negotiations

LD1204090290 Moscow TASS in English 0828 GMT 12 Apr 90

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Bogdanov]

[Text] Manila April 12 TASS—The Philippines and the United States have agreed on the dates of bilateral negotiations on the future of American bases in the Philippines.

The delegations of the two countries will open talks in Manila on May 14. This has become known after U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for South East Asian and Pacific Affairs Richard Solomon's meetings with senior officials of the Corazon Aquino administration.

Solomon ends his official visit to Manila today.

"The two sides will first find out whether it is in the national interests of the Philippines to preserve U.S. military bases on Philippine territory," a Philippine Foreign Ministry spokesman told journalists.

When a decision on the issue is taken, the Philippine delegation will start to discuss specifically the terms for the continued stay of the Pentagon's bases in the country, a Philippine Foreign Ministry spokesman told journalists. The spokesman rejected Solomon's statement made after his meeting with Foreign Minister Raul Manglapus that bilateral negotiations from their inception would deal with the elaboration of mutually acceptable terms of a new agreement on the future of the U.S. military presence in the Philippines.

Manila meanwhile received reports that U.S. President George Bush had decided to appoint Richard Armitage, assistant defence secretary for international security affairs under the Reagan administration, as new head of the American delegation to negotiate the bases.

Commenting on the White House decision, Solomon said that the American side expected the consultations to be tense and therefore they should be conducted by a man who can pay full attention to the negotiations. American Ambassador to Manila Nicholas Plat is known to have been earlier appointed head of the U.S. delegation.

Reporting Armitage's appointment, Philippine newspapers stress that he knows the problems of the Asia-Pacific region, including the Philippines, and has a wealth of experience in elaborating major foreign policy decisions.

The appointment of Armitage, a man, who is known to be firmly in favour of the preservation of the Pentagon's bases in the Philippines, shows that the negotiations will be difficult and will be held amid growing obstinacy of the Corazon Aquino administration and the U.S. Government over the future of the American bases in the Philippines, THE MANILA CHRONICLE WRITES.

China

CPC's Song Ping Discusses Sino-Soviet Relations

LD1704082890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0135 GMT 17 Apr 90

[Text] Beijing, 17 Apr (TASS)—"Following last year's normalization of Sino-Soviet relations, links between the CPC and the CPSU are shaping up favorably and satisfactorily. The forthcoming visit to the USSR by Li Peng, member of the CPC Central Committee Political Bureau Standing Committee and chairman of the PRC State Council, will promote further development of relations between the two parties and the two states," said Song

Ping, member of the CPC Central Committee Political Bureau Standing Committee, at a meeting on Monday with a delegation from the CPSU Central Committee International Department headed by the department's first deputy head R. Fedorov.

Song Ping noted that in the present complex international situation the development of links and the exchange of views between the CPC and the CPSU are essential. The CPC Central Committee organ "RENMIN RIBAO" reports today that he spoke to his guests about the internal political situation in the PRC.

The head of the Soviet delegation emphasized the normal development of interparty relations over the past year, which provides favorable conditions for the development of relations between the two countries. He noted identity of views between the CPSU and the CPC on the importance of bilateral links.

Li Peng To Visit USSR 23-26 Apr

OW1504082390 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 14 Apr 90

[Text] A communique issued in Moscow states that Li Peng, premier of the Chinese State Council, will make an official visit to the Soviet Union from 23 to 26 April at the invitation of the Soviet Government. It is expected that his visit will lead to a more vigorous development of Soviet-Chinese relations, which were normalized when Gorbachev visited China nearly a year ago.

Recently, the Soviet president has said that our people highly value their friendship with China and will make every effort to promote Soviet-Chinese relations.

Visit Viewed

OW1504084390 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 13 Apr 90

["Short commentary" by political commentator (Roginov): "A New Stage"]

[Text] Dear listeners, you are now listening to Moscow Radio's "Half an Hour With (Wang Xiao) Program." Let's say something about the issue of Sino-Soviet relations. As far as we are concerned, this issue has a two-fold urgency. First of all, the month of May is the anniversary of Comrade Gorbachev's historical visit to your country and the complete normalization of Sino-Soviet relations. Secondly, the government delegation led by Comrade Li Peng of China's State Council will be visiting the USSR.

Now, please listen to a short commentary by Soviet political commentator (Roginov) entitled "A New Stage."

[Begin recording] [(Roginov)] The process of major world events, which might produce various results, is continuously developing. For example, the problem of German reunification, the influence of which lies far beyond the sphere of Europe, is unprecedentedly sharp. Remarkable progress has also been made in the Asia-Pacific region, where both the PRC and the USSR share common interests. One the one hand, cooperation between nations with different social systems has increasingly been active. A case in point is the continuously developing economic and trade contacts of the USSR and PRC with South Korea. We hope that this will be beneficial to improving the tense situation which has lasted for a long time in Asia-Pacific region. On the other hand, the process which contradicts the interests of stability and development in the region is far from being arrested. What I mean by this is the increasing military cooperation between Washington and Tokyo. In addition, the sanctions against China by Western countries are also of a negative nature.

However, dialogue and cooperation, generally speaking, is still the prevailing trend in international relations. The old practice of confrontation has been discarded. This is the general international environment in which Sino-Soviet negotiations will be conducted.

It is completely understandable, I believe, that at the present stage, both the USSR and the PRC are paying particular attention to reasonable solutions to the problems which have cropped up during the economic and political reforms in their respective countries in recent years. Of course, both of our countries hope to share each other's experiences. Although differing in national characteristics, both the USSR and the PRC share a major goal of improving socialism and trying to bring its creative potential into play.

It is expected that many issues will be involved in the upcoming Sino-Soviet negotiations in Moscow. As we all know, a good prospect for economic and trade cooperation between the USSR and the PRC lies before us. Both sides believe that it is very important to substantiate with concrete actions the agreements reached in Beijing last May. These agreements constitute a foundation for the relations of our two countries. At present, we are actively looking for new domains, new forms, and new ways for Sino-Soviet cooperation. We believe that the new stage of complete normalization of Sino-Soviet relations reached in last May will create a good future for both of our countries in expanding good- neighborly cooperation as well as for better cooperation on international stage. [end recording]

Sino-Soviet Relations Enter 'New Era'

OW1604114290 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1100 GMT 15 Apr 90

[From "World Today" program]

[Text] Soviet weekly NOVOYE VREMYA weekly carries an article by historian (Bayuenov) on Chinese foreign policy. The article also covers Sino-Soviet relations.

The visit to the PRC by Gorbachev means that Sino-Soviet relations have entered a new era. The May negotiations have been beneficial in promoting the development of the relations. In the second half of 1989, the first party delegations were exchanged and the military liaison offices were formed. In the near future, China's Premier Li Peng will pay a visit to USSR. Talks on the border issue are constantly being held. Talks on reducing armed forces along the border have also begun. Both countries have adopted long-term plans for economic, trade, scientific, and technological cooperation up to the year 2000. The volume of trade between the two countries in 1989 reached an all-time high of nearly 2.4 billion rubles. Representatives from the two countries have engaged in their contacts in a friendly atmosphere, full of good will. There have been no major discrepancies or conflicts.

However, after Gorbachev's visit to the PRC, certain factors immediately appeared and were grudually enlarged. These factors, if not casting a shadow on Sino-Soviet relations, at least will set the limit for mutual understanding. What we mean here is the ideologies of Soviet and Chinese communists, which became gradually closer during the period from 1987 to 1988, and then broke away again.

Since Soviet society continues to break away from the mode of its old days, the ideological discrepancies between the USSR and PRC are becoming wider. However, this does not mean that Sino-Soviet relations, which were just normalized not long ago, will face danger.

China clearly understands that the days of great debate have gone forever. The destiny of the socialist system is determined by the unity of the people who are loyal to it and its common results. The importance and reliance of Sino-Soviet relations are determined by the support for, and appreciation of, Soviet reforms by Chinese citizens of all strata. In his NOVOYE VREMYA article, Soviet historian Dr. (Bayuenov) says that, despite Soviet society having different view on Chinese soldiers' action in Tiananmen Square, the USSR still earnestly hopes that it can maintain friendly contacts with its great neighbor.

U.S. Peace Corps To Return to Sichuan

OW1704030190 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 14 Apr 90

[Text] The United States and China have agreed through consultations that activities of the volunteer group, the Peace Corps, be resumed in Sichuan Province.

This was announced in Beijing by a spokesman of the U.S. Embassy in China. As agreed upon by the two sides, the Peace Corps will send a group of 20 volunteers to Sichuan to teach English.

The Peace Corps began its activities in China a few years ago, but some of its plans were cancelled due to last year's Tiananmen incident.

As we have reported, the United States and China reached agreement two weeks ago to resume the exchange of university students and teachers. According to the protocal signed, 16 American professors will go to China to teach in institutions of higher education this school year.

Northeast Asia

PRAVDA Reports Debates at MPRP Congress

PM1504170390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Apr 90 Second Edition p 5

[Dispatch by special correspondents V. Sapov and V. Sharov: "Difficult Path Toward Trust"]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 11 Apr—Early this morning we witnessed people standing in line outside newspaper kiosks to buy UNEN as they hurried to work. This issue of the newspaper is devoted to the extraordinary MPRP [Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party] Congress that is being held in Ulaanbaatar.

The attention of the country's public is riveted on the sessions hall. We find the explanations for this in the published report which G. Ochirbat, general secretary of the MPRP Central Committee, delivered at the forum yesterday: "This is the first time an extraordinary congress has been held in the history of the MPRP. The delegates have a special responsibility and are faced with comprehensively discussing the situation that has taken shape in the country, analyzing the party's activity, and defining ways to renew it and to deepen perestroyka. The fate not only of the party but also of the country as a whole will depend on the resolution of these questions."

The congress Secretariat has reported that approximately 500 delegates—virtually one in every two—wished to speak in the debate on the questions under discussion.

The speakers emphasized that perestroyka is a struggle to build a humane and just democratic society freed from the administrative-bureaucratic system and giving man an opportunity to display his abilities and gifts to the full. The first results of perestroyka were noted—the growth of the working people's political activeness and the assertion of an atmosphere of democracy and openness.

We will have to reinterpret the problems, it was said from the congress rostrum, and find effective paths of social progress reflecting the specific national characteristics. The party badly needs to draw appropriate lessons from the mistakes and shortcomings. Unfortunately, the list of errors has proved too great. Mounting the rostrum, delegates spoke of stagnation phenomena in the

economy and the extensive nature of its development. Social tension has been increasing recently.

Neglect in a vitally important sector of the country—agriculture and, above all, livestock raising—was noted by MPR [Mongolian People's Republic] Hero of Labor M. Altangerel, machine operator from Selenge Aymag; D. (Ochirkhoyag), secretary of the party organization of Darhan Somon in Hentiy Aymag; T. (Ulziybat), chairman of an agricultural association in Tsogt Somon, Govi-Altay Aymag; and other delegates. Forced industrialization had an adverse effect on the resolution of the countryside's social problems. The huge capital investments made by the state treasury did not have the expected effect. Today 116 out of 255 agricultural associations are unable to eliminate their debts.

S. Dashdabaa, staffer of the MPRP Central Committee Social Sciences Institute, and other speakers spoke about distortions in the spiritual life of society.

The country has recently been in the grip of a wave of rallies, demonstrations, and political debates. The path traveled by people's Mongolia is increasingly frequently being subjected to unsubstantiated criticism and sometimes overt slander in the course of polemics and in ideological clashes. It was repeatedly pointed out from the congress rostrum that it would be a mistake to deny the tremendous labor of the creative people and to portray the past only in black hues.

The problem of the present day occupied the chief place in the debate at the congress. Delegates are raising questions acutely—why has the country entered a period of crisis development, and how come the MPRP is lagging behind events at this crucial time? A collective search is on in the sessions hall for the answer to these questions.

In recent years the distance between the party and the people has been increasing all the more, S. Bator, sector head at the Military History Institute, said. Words have been at variance with deeds. In many instances the party has been unable to express the working people's fundamental interests, and its prestige has fallen. The renewal of the MPRP has become an urgent necessity.

Speakers point out that the former leadership of the MPRP Central Committee failed to realize in good time that the process of perestroyka is a natural process and failed to elaborate specific theoretical and political concepts of the renewal of the party and society. The Fifth MPRP Central Committee Plenum (1988) made an attempt to break the course of events and involve the country and the party in the process of perestroyka. But that attempt was not backed up by proper organization or by ideological work.

The extraordinary congress has to discuss and adopt two program documents: "Basic Guidelines of Party Policy for the Immediate Future" and "On Tasks of Renewing the MPRP." Many specific proposals are being made in this connection. Some of them concern improving the party's organizational structure and the norms of internal party relations. The current MPRP Statutes are entirely geared to protecting the party's monopoly rights in a one-party state. It is necessary to do away with the cumbersome apparatus bogged down in red tape, reduce it in size, and transfer the party to self-financing. A demand is being made for the "emancipation" of internal party relations, and the idea of asserting the principle of democratic unity is being aired persistently.

The MPRP is now living and functioning in conditions of a multiparty system. In the upcoming elections it will compete with other political forces on an equal footing. While criticizing the opposition's extremist statements and actions, at the same time it must act as a consolidating force.

The delegates are devoting a lot of attention to MPRP foreign policy. The speakers allocate an important place in the country's external relations to all-around cooperation with the Soviet Union and other fraternal states. Our cooperation is embarking on a path of democratization and renewal within the channel of the perestroyka under way in the USSR and the MPR. Ways are being sought to increase its efficiency. Speakers point out that the friendship and cooperation of the Mongolian and Soviet peoples have been and still are an important factor in the MPR's development. "Working people in the Mongolian countryside perceive with pain attempts to forget, slander, and accuse friendly countries, particularly the country that has given us tremendous assistance—the Soviet Union," L. Suhbat, livestock raiser from Ovorhangay Aymag, declared. "Our people wish to deepen and strengthen fraternal ties with friendly countries. This must be reflected in the platform which we will adopt and in the party's further deeds." The work of the extraordinary MPRP Congress is proceeding in an exacting, constructive atmosphere.

Mongolian Hural Session Scheduled for 10 May

LD1504113790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0520 GMT 15 Apr 90

[Text] Ulaanbaatar 15 April, (TASS)—The start of work of the ninth session of the Mongolian People's Republic [MPR] Great People's Hural of the 11th convocation has been postponed from 5 to 10 May. This decision was made by the Presidium of the MPR Great People's Hural in connection with the need for more thorough preparations for the next sitting of the Mongolian parliament. It was published in today's UNEN.

The next session of the Great People's Hural is due to adopt two new laws that are intended to make the process of renewing the country's political system more dynamic, namely, laws on political parties and on additions to the MPR's Constitution. Both bills are now being discussed nationwide.

Draft Laws Sought

LD1504144190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0954 GMT 15 Apr 90

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 15 April (TASS)—With a view to deepening the processes of democratization in society and improving the political system in the country, the Presidium of the People's Great Hural of the Mongolian People's Republic has adopted a decision about the elaboration of new draft laws. In particular, an instruction has been given to the corresponding ministries and central departments to make ready, jointly with the Central Council of Mongolian Trade Unions, the executive committee of the Revolutionary Youth Union, and the board of the Union of Mongolian Journalists, draft laws on trade unions, the Mongolian youth, and the press.

The newspaper UNEN reports today that the draft law on trade unions should be presented to the Presidium of the People's Great Hural of the Mongolian People's Republic already in the second quarter of this year, the draft law on the Mongolian youth in the fourth quarter, and the draft law on the press in the first quarter of 1990 [sentence as received].

Korean Air Begins Flights Over Soviet Union

PM1004083490 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Interview with Korean Air Vice President Chang Sam Ko (name as transliterated) by special correspondent V. Belikov in Seoul: "Moscow-Seoul: Mutually Advantageous Route"—date of interview not stated; first two paragraphs are Belikov introduction]

[Text] Seoul— As IZVESTIYA reported, in April Aeroflot and the South Korean company Korean Air opened direct air communication.

In Korean Air headquarters, company Vice President Chang Sam-ko gave an interview to IZVESTIYA's correspondent.

[Chang Sam-ko] Aeroflot and ourselves have moved persistently toward setting up this air route for almost two years. It all began as far back as the eve of the 1988 Olympic games, when the idea of conveying the sportsmen and guests of the Seoul games via an "aerial Trans-Siberian Railway" was born. International Olympic Committee President Samaranch came out in support of creating such an air link and sent a letter to the Soviet leadership. Permission was received for Korean Air flights over Soviet territory.

[Belikov] What does the opportunity to fly a new route offer your airline?

[Chang Sam-ko] Over the past 20 years Korean Air has increased the number of passengers it transports on domestic and international lines many times over. Last year it conveyed just over 11 million people to 31 cities of the world and within its own country. Its 64 airliners carry out more than 80 flights weekly to Japan alone, and more than 30 flights to the United States.

At the same time, up to now we have been flying only nine times a week to Western Europe, where our firms and corporations have more and more business interests. These flights are very long, because they pass over the polar regions of Canada and the Atlantic or over Southeast Asia and the Near East. The gain of more than four hours which the trans-Siberian route offers will be decisive for many passengers in their choice of route.

[Belikov] Your airline was state-owned, then it became a private company, and in recent years it has won world recognition and success, as have many other firms in your country. Is it prestigious to work for Korean Air?

[Chang Sam-ko] About 13,000 people work for the company. There is a competitive recruitment system for virtually all posts. With stewardesses, for instance, 20 girls apply for each vacancy. The same hard selection process awaits those wishing to get into one of the airline's ground services. The selection of pilots is also difficult—the demands made on them are even higher. Therefore those who work for us are proud of their employment.

News Conference Held on Air Route

SK1004134690 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 3 Apr 90

[Text] A press conference concerning the opening of a direct air route between the Soviet Union and the ROK was held on 2 April in Moscow. The press conference was held by (Yi Hyon-sok), director of the Civil Aviation Bureau of the ROK Ministry of Transportation.

[Begin (Yi Hyon-sok) recording] The inauguration of the Korean Air Lines [KAL] flights to Moscow and the inauguration of the Soviet air lines flights to Seoul are a tangible outcome of the northern policy of President No Tae-u of the ROK and the perestroyka of President Gorbachev of the Soviet Union. I think that the opening of the direct air route between the two countries is of great significance in providing the foundation for economic flights between the civil aviation companies of the two countries and in more closely maintaining relations between the two countries and between their people.

Also, I believe that the opening of the air route between the two countries will serve as the foundation for promoting personnel and material exchanges between the ROK and the Soviet Union, for strengthening cultural exchange and cooperation between them, and for promoting economic exchange and cooperation between them.

With the start of cooperation with the Soviet Union this time in the aviation field, the ROK Government will promote cooperation in the aviation field with East European countries, namely, Yugoslavia, Poland, Czecholovakia, and Romania, in the future.

I would like to take this opportunity to wish the KAL success in its flight service to Moscow and the Soviet air lines success in the flight service to Seoul in the future.

In conclusion, I would like to express deep thanks to the Soviet Government authorities and the Soviet aviation authorities for their support and cooperation extended to the KAL, and I hope that such support and cooperation will continue in the future, too. [end recording]

Responding to questions raised by reporters from Soviet mass media, Mr. (Yi Hyon-sok) said that the Soviet Aeroflot Aviation Company and the KAL will make one flight a week respectively. Responding to the question, "Are there any plans to increase the number of flights in the future?" he said:

[Begin (Yi Hyon-sok) recording] I think that the present number of flights between the Soviet Union and the ROK is enough. However, I think that as relations between the ROK and the Soviet Union are further promoted, the number of flights will increase. In such a case, I think that the two aviation companies will be able to increase the number of flights to meet the demand. [end recording]

[Announcer reads question] Does your civil aviation company have any plans to deal with cargo transportation?

[Begin (Yi Hyon-sok) recording] The aviation agreement between our two companies stipulates this problem. However, at present we do not have enough demand for cargo transportation. If the demand for cargo transportation increases, yes, we will deal with cargo transportation. [end recording]

[Announcer reads question] How is the situation in the solution of the building problem for the KAL office in Moscow?

[Begin (Yi Hyon-sok) recording] Regarding this problem, I met an official concerned in the Soviet Ministry of Civil Aviation this morning and had a discussion with him. He told me that office buildings are still scarce in Moscow and that he has not arranged for an office for KAL. He promised me that he will do his best to get an office for KAL. I hope that the Soviet Government will find not only an office for KAL, but also an office for the ROK concular department. [end recording]

You have listened to the report on a press conference of the KAL in connection with the opening of the air route between the Soviet Union and the ROK.

Businessman View USSR-ROK Cooperation

SK1004134590 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 3 Apr 90

[Text] Some time ago we told you about the Soviet-ROK symposium held in the Soviet Union. Extensive discussion was held in it on broad issues in the relations between the Soviet Union and the ROK ranging from scientific relations to business relations. The chief sponsor of the major events in the overall relations was (Intergermes), a production-commerce incorporation [saengsan sangop chonghapche]. We requested (Vagen Sokhorov), chairman of (Intergermes) Council, to disclose his plan for the future cooperation with the business delegates of the ROK.

[Begin (Sokhorov) recording in Russian fading into Korean translation] I express my deep gratitude to Mr Kim Un-yong, vice chairman of the International Olympic Committee, and Non No Company for inviting us to visit the ROK.

I view this initiative as [word indistinct] of great mutual understanding and trust and of the cooperation between the business circles of the ROK and the Soviet Union. I have already met the delegates of the ROK business circles several times.

For instance, we met Hwang Myong-su and Kang In-suk, ROK national assemblymen, last year. We were a chief sponsor for the Soviet-ROK symposium in February this year. I would like to stress that this symposium was possible thanks to the new situation created by the positive change in the Soviet Union and the ROK and the development of international relations. We express satisfaction that the participants in the symposium frankly expressed their views. Because of this, we were able to [word indistinct] the effective (?situation) of cooperation, and to provide a condition for business activities. In this way, (Intergermes) has been making its best efforts to contribute to the development of cooperation between the Soviet Union and the ROK.

According to an ancient Greek myth, Hermes is the god of commerce. [end recording]

Please tell us about your incorporation.

[Begin (Sokhorov) recording in Russian fading into Korean translation]

(Intergermes), a production-commerce incorporation, is a new phenomenon of the Soviet economy, which was born with the advent of perestroyka. It comprises many cooperative bodies and one of the production management sectors of the Executive Committee of the People's Deputy Soviet of the (Galinskiy) district of Moscow. The (Galinskiy) district is one of the best industrially developed metropolitan districts, and the joint venture bank is a good basis. We maintain close ties with other enterprises in cities and provinces, and our delegates are stationed in Leningrad, Krasnodar, (Knomagenistov), the large industrial centers of (Talid) of (Nadrid), and other cities.

I would like to remind you of the remarks of professor (Yasim), member of the Economic Reform Committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet. He said that the foresighted foreign businessmen who are willing to invest their capital for the economic development of our

country will certainly earn profit from it in 2 years. I think they will make a profit earlier than that. Our production-commerce incorporation, (Intergermes), facilitates the necessary transactions in the (?mutual) cooperation in [words indistinct] of the joint venture companies which the (Intergermes) (?aims at). [end recording]

In what areas do you think this cooperation will be possible?

[Begin (Sokhorov) recording in Russian fading into Korean translation] We can cooperate with the ROK companies based on the ROK technological process in the production of construction materials and household appliances, assembling computers, the production of audio and video tapes, the production of clothing, the construction of buildings, [word indistinct], and many other fields. Apart from pure production activities, we can afford to jointly make programs and make a study of, and make a long-term exploration of, the Soviet domestic market. Finally, I would like to remind you of the remarks by Mr Han Tong-su, vice president of the Hyundai Group. He said that a will and enthusiastic aspiration are required to succeed in joint venture enterprises. I would like to add to it the unique talent and diligence of the ROK people. In short, we would like to form long-term and effective cooperation with the ROK businessmen. [end recording]

USSR-ROK Academic Cooperation 'in Motion'

SK1704101190 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 12 Apr 90

[Text] During his recent visit to the Soviet Union, Mr. Kim Yong-sam, cochairman of South Korea's governing Democratic Liberal Party, said that he would see that contacts between civilian sectors—including in the area of science—are increased drastically in the course of developing relations between the two countries. Cooperation as such has already been put in motion not just between scientific institutions, such as the Soviet Academy of Sciences and the ROK Fund for Science and Technology, but also between the educational institutions of our two countries.

In October 1989, Moscow National University and Yonsei University signed an agreement on defining the general principles and tenor of cooperation. A delegation of the Moscow National University that has returned from a recent visit to the ROK signed a protocol on giving shape to joint projects between the two universities,and each country's distinguished institutions of higher learning.

(Sergey Rinenko), vice president of the Moscow National University in charge of a department specializing in diplomatic ties, summed up the visit to the ROK by the delegation of his university and said the following about the prospect of cooperation in the future: [Begin recording, in Russian fading into the Korean translation] Our visit was interesting in many ways. First, this was a contact between the academic functionaries. Lecturer Ogunov, head of our delegation, delivered speeches at meetings of the ROK Association of the University Presidents and of the Society for Studying Communist Affairs. We were taken on a tour of the Institute for the Studies of International Relations under the control of the Foreign Ministry and met with the South Korean physicists and college students. I believe that we can broaden the range of the persons with whom we promote our cooperation. In other words, we do not intend to confine our cooperative ties to only Yonsei University.

Second, we also met with leading ROK political activists. We were given a reception by President No Tae-u. We also were given receptions by Messrs. Kim Yong-sam and Kim Chong-pil, cochairmen of the ROK governing party, as well as by the ministers of foreign affairs, science and technology, sports, and education. In these meetings, we discussed the status of bilateral relations and the prospects for their future development.

I also would like to note the fact that the representatives of the ROK business circles showed great interest in our visit. We were left with a strong impression after touring a series of industrial enterprises and research centers. In fact, South Korea has achieved great accomplishments. The South Korean business circles's desire to invest a very high degree of technological process and a considerable amount of funds in the development of science and education has left us with a strong impression.

In the course of touring Pohang Iron and Steel, one of South Korea's large steel mills, we looked around the college and technological center founded by this company. In my opinion, these buildings and the equipment there are at the level of the beginning of the 21st century. Even the U.S. specialists who had visited this company are said to have expressed views similar to mine. We also acquainted ourselves with the status of production in the areas of means of communications, automobiles, and electric goods and toured Daewoo Shipyard. [passage omitted]

Following the above remarks, Deputy President (Rinenko), answering a question raised by a reporter who asked what was his prospect for cooperation between the Moscow National University and the educational institutions and companies in the ROK, said:

[Begin recording, in Russian fading into Korean translation] We have invited not only the representatives of the scientific circles, but also the representatives of political and business circles to visit Moscow. Discussion of proposals on organizing joint ventures based on the ROK's high degree of technological progress is also under way as part of a preliminary effort. I believe we can arrange the training of Russian linguists in the ROK in the near future.

Daewoo Shipyard expressed its wish to participate in the development of Moscow National University. According to a recent decision by our country's government, our university has additionally been given tracts of lands in

an area close to Mt. Lenin in Moscow. We are planning to redouble the number of teachers and dormitories and develop the scientific and production bases by the 21st century.

Samsung company was interested in joint research of radar-related technology and physics of high-intensity energy. A bunch of proposals from the South Korean steel mills will help our metallurgical sectors solve their problems. The exchange of students and professors scheduled for this year and the giving of lectures by South Korean businessmen can be realized. For example, on any given day the president of Daewoo company can give a lecture in a business class organized by the economics department of the Moscow National University.

As is seen, an enumeration of our joint proposals alone tellingly shows how vigorously the contacts between us are developing now. In other words, we are moving forward toward constant cooperation from the stage of showing mutual interests. [end recording]

Answering a question by a reporter who said that the growing volume of cooperation calls for a considerable expansion of Korean linguists in the Soviet Union and asked what kind of plans he had in this regard, vice president (Rinenko) remarked: [Begin recording in Russian fading into the Korean translation] My answer is that we have already discussed this matter during our stay in the ROK and this I think is a sufficient answer to your question.

Concerning this, (Rottin), vice president of the Moscow National University, recalled the days when he worked teaching the Japanese language at a time when Soviet-Japanese relations became active which in turn caused the number of students majoring in the Japanese language at the school of Asian and African Affairs at the Moscow National University to increase manifold. For the same reason, we believe that the interest in learning the Korean language will grow. New curriculum will be arranged to help those who are engaged in in-depth study of the Korean history, economics, language, and social affairs. I think our contacts with Yonsei University will serve as an (?indispensable) guarantee for this process. Cooperation between us is not a passing fad, but a demand of the times.

ROK Participation in 'Rimpac' Drill Criticized

SK1304115390 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 12 Apr 90

[From the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] (Aleksandr Kozlov), commentator of the Soviet paper KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, wrote an article on the U.S. military policy pursued in the Asian and Pacific region.

The article notes: Richard Cheney, U.S. secretary of defense, recently suggested that the U.S. military bases would be closed in some Asian countries and the U.S. troops deployed there would also be reduced.

However, one can still doubt that Washington's initial plan aimed at decreasing the level of military confrontation in Asia would really be put into practice.

Events have developed one after another to make people suspicious of Washington's true intention.

The commentator of KRASNAYA ZVEZDA says he would like to discuss the "Rimcpac-90" military exercise.

The commentator says that the military exercise is being staged in the area between California and the Hawaiian Islands.

In the military exercise, 500 naval vessels and 250 aircraft are being mobilized from the air and naval forces of the United States, Japan, South Korea, Canada, and Australia.

This naval military exercise has been conducted twice a year [as heard] for about 20 years.

One may say it is inappropriate to attach any political significance to the military exercise.

However, the ongoing multinational military exercise clearly reflects the political and military situation in the Pacific region.

I would like to remind you that Japan started to participate in the military exercise 10 years ago. This has triggered Japan's drastic military buildup and, as a result of this, Tokyo has come to play an even greater role in the framework of the U.S.-Japanese military alliance. The Japanese navy has been invested with the right to control the 1,000-mile sea zones around the Japanese islands. Thus, it has undertaken the task to blockade three sea channels in the Far East. [words indistinct]

The ROK has joined the exercise for the first time. Seoul's assertion that the ROK feels a need to secure its sea routes because of its expanding foreign trade is not convincing.

There is no doubt who has brought the (?ROK) into the military exercise.

The Pentagon is trying to include all of its allies in staging the military exercise.

Such being the situation, the (?expansion of the military bloc), the commentator of Soviet military newspaper KRASNAYA ZVEZDA notes in conclusion, will continue to bind the Asian and Pacific region, despite some affirmative changes.

DPRK Economists Describe 'Taean' System

PM1204152390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Apr 90 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent S. Tikhomirov report: "Who Commands the Parade"]

[Excerpts] Pyongyang— The Soviet reader has not had to rely on the grapevine for information about the economic reforms now taking place in the majority of socialist countries. How the DPRK economy works or, more exactly, the theoretical model on which the DPRK economy is based is not so widely known. But I think that this topic may be of a certain interest, if only from the viewpoint of experience; and experience, as we know, can be varied. The industrial management system is known here as the Taean system. I asked the DPRK Institute of the National Economy to explain in more detail what it is.

My collocutors were Prof. So Chae-yong, director of the chair of politics and economics at the Institute of the National Economy and a doctor of science, and Pak Pyong-ho, a teacher from the institute's industry department.

[Pak Pyong-ho] In 1961 the Great Leader, Comrade Kim Il-song, carried out on-site management of a Taean electrical engineering plant for two weeks and created the industrial management system which also received the name Taean. The basis of production management in industry is collective. What do we mean by this concept? The head of an industrial enterprise is not the director but a party committee. This committee consists as a rule of the party secretary of the enterprise, his deputies, the directors of social organizations—for example, trade unions—the director, workshop chiefs, and the chief engineer. The number of party committee members can be as many as 35, depending on the size of the enterprise. [passage omitted]

[Tikhomirov] Next year the Taean system will mark its 30th anniversary. But life does not stop in the same place; don't you consider that the system has become at all antiquated, or requires some changes?

[Pak Pyong-ho] Not at all. It combines harmoniously with our socialist system and responds to its essence, the principle of collectivism.

[So Chae-yong] In our opinion, socialism is above all collectivism in the processes of production and in everyday life. It cannot be otherwise.

[Tikhomirov] Excuse me, but then how is it that it's Marshal Kim Il-song—I don't quite understand? [Tikhomirov ends]

After a minute's reflection, So Chae-yong replies firmly: "There is no contradiction. Every collective has its nucleus. I think on the whole that every people must have its leader. The nucleus of our people is Great Leader Comrade Kim Il-song."

[Tikhomirov] What is your attitude to the economic reforms happening now in the Soviet Union and the countries of East Europe?

[So Chae-yong] We do not have a special opinion on this score. Peoples manage their own fates. And we wish them success on the road to socialism.

[Tikhomirov] Let us be frank, the DPRK economy is experiencing difficulties. Don't you think that one of the causes of this is the seemingly stagnant, and perhaps not always effective Taean system by which, as you say, not only the country's industry but also its rural-economy sector is managed? After all, we know that you cannot go far on revolutionary fervor alone.

[So Chae-yong] You are right, the spirit of the Taean system is utilized by our rural laborers also. As for difficulties, the Taean system has nothing to do with them. The problem lies elsewhere, in the inability of individual managers to work according to a great system. Besides, our institute exists to study the Taean economic system. Every year around 300 people headed for management work graduate from the institute.

[Tikhomirov] When in your opinion will the Taean system begin to operate at full strength, and when will it bring genuine returns?

[So Chae-yong] We intend to keep to our chosen model in the future, too. Unfortunately, very often the fact that a change of generations takes place is an impediment. [So Chae-yong ends]

At first I thought that my collocutor was joking, but he was absolutely serious. So his entire demeanor expressed an unfeigned anxiety.

Pentagon To Dissolve Mock-Soviet Air Wing

SK1204053390 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 2 Apr 90

[Talk from the program "Focus on Asia"]

[Text] The U.S. Defense Department is planning to dissolve the 26th Special U.S. Air Force Company deployed at Kadena Air Force Base in Okinawa which is known by the passwords, "Aggressor within the friendly forces."

The commentator of this radio station writes as follows: The aggressor company, which is known as the Red air force company, has F-5 fighters which are camouflaged as Soviet MiG-21's. This company has been active in the U.S. Air Force since the "Red Flag" exercise plan was adopted in the seventies. At that time, the U.S. generals, who were analyzing the causes of failure in the Vietnam war, ran amok with various forms of war maneuvers.

They worked out a plan of war exercises for participation by units of the armed forces whereby they acted like the enemy forces and carried out enemy strategy in order to create a situation with the closest resemblance to real

combat. Other branches of the U.S. Armed Forces had plans similar to the "Red Flag" exercise.

Furthermore, in order to ensure a more realistic situation, they let soldiers, who acted as the enemy force, wear Soviet soldier uniforms with marks showing ranks and positions and use the Russian language. Needless to say, attaining the maximum realism in military exercises was these (?generals') wish. However, in addition to the strategic aspect, this exercise had a psychological aspect, more correctly, an ideological aspect. Such a plan for a mock battle is not only designed to research the enemy's strategy but also pursue the aim of fostering antagonism against the Soviet soldiers by describing them as the enemy.

The policy of military confrontation (?runs counter) to seeking the means for mutual understanding and cooperation. Antagonism and stereotype methods of the cold-war era are fading away. Thus, the Pentagon has adopted a decision to dissolve the aggressor-air force company deployed in the Japanese territory.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Inconsistency of U.S. Policy on Cambodia Viewed

BK1504095290 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1100 GMT 14 Apr 90

[Oleg Alekseyev commentary]

[Text] The United States should completely review its lines on Cambodia. This was stated to the ASSOCIATED PRESS news agency by U.S. Senator Robert Kerrey. Mr. Kerrey said that the United States should stop providing arms to opposing groups in Cambodia because there is a danger that these weapons might fall into the hands of the Khmer Rouge. Our observer, Comrade Oleg Alekseyev, writes:

It seems that the U.S. senator did not fully assess the current situation. He only talked about the danger of U.S. weapons falling into the hands of the Khmer Rouge, meaning the Pol Pot group. However, it is clearly known that this situation has been confirmed a long time ago. Weapons and ammunition sent to the Sihanouk or Son Sann groups have constantly fallen into the hands of Pol Pot extremists. There have been countless examples of this in the past few years. As the Thai paper BANGKOK POST recently noted, more than half of the weapons to be dispatched to Sihanouk and Son Sann forces were seized by armed Khmer Rouge groups, which usually control the roads for transporting weapons into Cambodia. On this point, the policy Washington has adopted on Cambodia has not been consistent.

As everyone knows, U.S. official circles have for a long time firmly denounced the criminal and blood-letting acts committed by the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia in the second half of the 1970's. Washington has directly said it does not want to have any contact with this extremist group responsible for large scale genocide in Cambodia.

At the international conference on Cambodia in Paris in August of last year, the United States affirmed to all delegates that it considers important any measure to prevent the Khmer Rouge from returning to power. Is this type of statement consistent with U.S. activities which, in practice, have provided military aid to the Son Sann and Sihanouk groups? In our view it is not, because as we have noted, U.S. weapons destined for Son Sann and Sihanouk forces, in the end, fall into the hands of those guilty of destroying three million Cambodian lives. What is this if not concrete aid to those whose past activities and current plans seem to have been denounced by Washington? Does the U.S. administration want demoniac politicians to be in power again in Cambodia, people who had plunged the country into blood-letting terrorism. Personally, I doubt this.

Therefore, it is time for Washington to draw an appropriate conclusion from the current situation? U.S. Senator Robert Kerrey certainly holds the correct view that the United States should absolutely stop providing any kind of weapons to opposing Cambodian groups. Only in this manner can one talk about the consistency of Washington's policies on an issue which, in Cambodia and many other countries, is considered a key issue for a future Cambodian solution.

This was stated by our observer Comrade Oleg Alekseyev.

UN Participation in Cambodian Solution Examined

BK1204102590 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1100 GMT 11 Apr 90

[Aleksey Nikolayev commentary]

[Text] How should the conflict in Cambodia be eliminated? Concerning this, people have been placing a great deal of hope with the United Nations lately. Our commentator, Comrade Aleksey Nikolayev, has this comment:

Those who favor UN participation in a Cambodian solution have correctly pointed out the concrete role this international body has played in settling regional conflicts, such as the one in Afghanistan and the Iran-Iraq conflict. The latest, most effective role was the UN peace mission in Namibia.

Not accidentally, but inspired by this example, the Australian leadership proposed implementation of the Namibia formula in Cambodia. This idea has won support from both the Phnom Penh government and the Cambodian opposition groups.

The ASEAN countries and UN Security Council's five permanent members—the Soviet Union, China, the United States, England, and France—have actively studied this idea. As a matter of fact, this subject has been a major issue in all recent meetings and talks on Cambodia.

Thanks to Phnom Penh's goodwill—which has opened the way for the United Nations to take part in restoring peace in Cambodia—Mr. Hun Sen's government has agreed in principle to the establishment in his country of an interim UN mechanism charged with the duty of verifying the fulfillment of all international agreements on Cambodia and organizing and supervising a general election. Moreover, the State of Cambodia is ready to discuss a formula for UN participation in the civil administration in the transition period.

Another important issue is the agreement signed between Comrade Hun Sen and Samdech Sihanouk in Bangkok in February. The two sides agreed on the need for the United Nations to be present in Cambodia for an appropriate period during the transition and during formation of a national supreme council, which would be a symbol of national unity and sovereignty. After a comprehensive solution is achieved, this national supreme council would occupy the Cambodian seat at the United Nations and other international organizations.

A few days ago, Samdech Sihanouk issued a statement calling on the United Nations to take part, without delay, in seeking a solution to the Cambodian problem. For example, he proposed that the UN peacekeeping forces, called the blue berets, be sent to Cambodia to supervise the cease-fire among the warring groups and [words indistinct].

According to Sihanouk, a major mission would be to ensure the arrangement of a general election in Cambodia in cooperation with the national supreme council. The supreme council would be composed of six personages from the Cambodian opposition group and an equal number of representatives from the Government of the State of Cambodia.

Observers have regarded as a turning point toward realism the fact that in this proposal, Sihanouk did not demand dissolution of the Government of the State of Cambodia.

The State of Cambodia's stance is clearly known. The most important thing now and in the future is to seek ways for a solution.

In his reply to Sihanouk's proposal on convening a four-party Cambodian meeting, Comrade Prime Minister Hun Sen reiterated his readiness to continue a dialogue with the Cambodian opposition groups.

For its part, the United Nations is also ready to help eradicate the conflict in Cambodia. Another round of talks on Cambodia between the UN Security Council's five permanent members is scheduled for May in New York. The five members will meet again in Paris and hold discussions with representatives of the four Cambodian factions, if sufficient conditions are created.

SRV Economic Reform Brings Corruption Problems

PM0904160790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent B. Vinogradov dispatch: "Vietnam: Problems With the New Reforms"]

[Text] Hanoi—The Vietnamese press cannot be said to be hushing up in any way information about corruption and economic crimes committed by officials. The newspapers are doing their duty by providing the the public with timely objective information about the trials in which instances of extortion or bribery are being investigated. Glasnost in this context is ensured irrespective of the place the defendant held in the official hierarchy.

Local journalists believe that it is not only the fact that the press has become bold and more relaxed during the years of renewal but rather that in the course of the economic reforms and the emergence of new forms of economic activity various abuses have formed a turbulent scum on the surface of public life alongside the many positive elements. In conditions of imperfect internal legislation and an imperfect tax system, HANOI MOI writes, free market laws create scope for private enterprise, which in turn provides a breeding ground for underhand operators. Bribes and bribery, traditional in feudal Vietnam, are casting a shadow over daily life here—or normal business relations—with increasing frequency. For instance, officials—tax collectors or people employed in departments distributing trade and cottage industry licenses—were given extensive powers, which they often use for gain.

However, it is not only officials who commit economic crimes. Embezzlement of public funds from private banks, which mushroomed after being given authorization to receive the population's money, assumed epidemic proportions last year. The widespread so-called "pool system" [sistema skladchiny] played a particular role here. Esssentially this meant that everyone who so desired could put their savings in this bank at a fairly high rate of interest—up to 25 percent a month. The monies collected by the bank were issued as credit at even higher rates of interest to entrepreneurs and cooperative workers starting up and, if everything went smoothly, were then returned plus 25 percent to the shareholders, providing the bank with a great deal of revenue. But things did not always go "smoothly." In some cases the credit was not repaid because the firms that opened up went bust and in others the bank proprietor disappeared out of his depositors' sight—usually abroad—taking all their cash with him.

In 1989 alone, for instance, private banks in Ho Chi Minh extorted more than 200 billion dong from the population through tempting rates of interest and promises. Disappointed investors demanding the return of their money and strict measures against the sharks recently held a large demonstration in front of the Ho Chi Minh National Assembly building.

There have been a considerable number of similar cases in Hanoi, Da Nang, Haiphong, and other cities in the SRV. Commenting on the situation, prominent economist Professor Dao Hong Tien pointed out that the government needs to take effective steps to regulate the situation in the financial sphere, otherwise this may result in political instability.

Over the last few days the newspapers' attention has been drawn to the trial of the owner of the "Tkhan Khyung" [name as transliterated] small cosmetics factory, who was also unable to return money that individual citizens had invested in production development in the past. The Ho Chi Minh prosecutor ordered the businessman's property to be confiscated, demanding that he settle his debts as soon as possible, otherwise the factory would be auctioned off. The local municipal authorities have pledged to provide the public with daily reports about all the ups and downs of this litigation.

An investigation is continuing alongside this into the cause and circumstances behind a fire at a 12-story building belonging to the "Imeksko" [name as transliterated] import and export company, where many important documents relating to loan deals with foreign firms were destroyed. Incidentally, another foreign trading company's warehouses burned down in Hanoi a week ago, as a result of which more than 1,000 imported colored televisions, along with a considerable quantity of Japanese motorcycles, clothing, and other valuable commodities were destroyed. There is no evidence of arson as yet, it is assumed that bad wiring might have been to blame, but people in the city are already saying that some people are using the fire to cover their criminal tracks.

The newspapers point out that all these cases only confirm that concern for the moral purity of society must not be relaxed during the period of economic transformations and revival of business activity, combining both the force of the law and the lofty socialist ideals by which the overwhelming majority of the country's working people live in the fight against crime.

Philippines's Laurel Urges Nonviolent Solutions

HK1204033190 Manila THE MANILA CHRONICLE in English 12 Apr 90 p 6

[By Johanna Son]

[Text] Vice President Salvador Laurel yesterday called on local communists to rejoin "the search for democratic and non-violent solutions" to national problems, saying the democratization of the East Bloc has isolated their method of armed struggle.

Speaking before the Third Summit Council for World Peace in Moscow, Laurel said Filipinos had hoped that the rebels would follow "international trends stressing human solidarity for peace" led by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's reforms.

This, Laurel said, was a way in which Filipinos can claim their own "peace dividend" from the end of the cold war.

When that happens, the Philippine Government could shift its resources from fighting the insurgency to national reconstruction, he said.

Laurel said the Philippines has "found it necessary" to triple its military budget since 1986 because of its counterinsurgency campaign.

"The Communist armed struggle (has reached a) deadend because (it) faced total international isolation," Laurel told the conference attended by world leaders and 200 journalists.

But while Gorbachev's reforms, primarily in Europe, have reduced "anxieties" even in Asia, they have not yet seeped through to individual nations like the Philippines, he said.

He said that a consequent change in security arrangements in East Asia and the Pacific would most likely "follow a more gradual course" than in Europe, because there are no ready structures for negotiations here like the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Warsaw Pact.

"The emerging superpowers of the next century, China and Japan, will undoubtedly not tolerate any vacuum in the region's power structure that will region's power structure that will result from any precipitate reduction of the U.S. presence," Laurel said.

The Moscow conference is attended by former heads of states and governments such as former Thai prime minister Thanom Kittikachorn and former Lebanese president Amin Gemayel.

Women's Group Leader Reviews Philippine Visit

HK1704035990 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 15 Apr 90

[Report on interview with Maria Kristoforova, head of the Soviet Women's Committee, newly returned from Philippine visit—recorded; date not given]

[Excerpts] Kristoforova explained that the Soviet Women's Committee is a public association set up almost 40 years ago. [passage omitted]

Asked about the kind of ties set up between the Committee and women in the Philippines, she said extensive ties were established, mainly involving friendly relations. She said this was not the group's first visit—the Committee visited the Philippines in 1976. The latest trip was on the invitation of a Filipino women's group called "Shoulder-to-Shoulder" on the occasion of International Women's Day on March 9. [passage omitted]

Kristoforova said her group was able to meet other women's groups such as New Philippines, GABRIELA

[General Assembly Binding Women for Reforms, Integrity, Equality, Leadership, and Action], National Federation of Women's Clubs, and others. She said that after visiting Manila, the group also went to Baguio where they attended a meeting at one of the universities there. She noted that Filipinos, unlike in the past, displayed knowledge about current happenings in the Soviet Union, which implied heightened interest in the Soviet Union, particularly in the changes now going on. Kristoforova said she fielded many questions, such as the role of women in Soviet society. Most of the questions were about religion, education, and the rearing of children. She said her group was impressed by the way Filipinos were facing up to their present problems. [passage omitted]

Near East & South Asia

Anniversary of Geneva Accords on Afghanistan Noted

LD1404225490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1200 GMT 14 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, 14 Apr (TASS)—"Spring 1988 brought hopes that peace would be established in Afghanistan: the Geneva agreements on a political settlement of the external aspects of the Afghan problem were signed on 14 April. In essence, this signified a potent breakthrough in the unblocking of one of the most complex and long-lasting conflict situations in the world," said Nikolay Kozyrev, special envoy of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Soviet diplomat was involved in elaborating and carrying through the Geneva accords, which were signed, with UN mediation, by Afghan and Pakistani representatives and countersigned by representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States.

In conversation with a TASS diplomatic correspondent today, Ambassador Kozyrev stressed the great international significiance of the Geneva documents. Above all, according to him, Geneva showed that a way out of the most intricate regional conflict situations can be found by using political means and peaceful methods. The decisions reached there showed that the new political thinking is steadily being adopted and that it is determining international relations as a whole.

The Geneva agreements also demonstrated to the world that the Soviet Union matches words with actions, something which was manifested above all in the pullout of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. And let us be blunt, the ambassador noted: If the other side fulfilled its obligations under the agreements, their effect would be particularly notable: the potential of Geneva is great.

Geneva demonstrated the great potential of the United Nations in resolving regional conflicts, Nikolay Kozyrev noted. Without any doubt, the agreements that were signed had an immense positive impact on the settlement in Namibia and Nicaragua. Since 1988 the UN General Assembly has been adopting resolutions on Afghanistan on the basis of "consensus"—general agreement. Previously, it had always got into a "lather" when such documents were being examined.

And the United Nations is now, together with representatives of the interested parties, directly coming to grips with all aspects of an Afghan settlement, the diplomat noted. Also continuing are the appropriate Soviet-U.S. contacts aimed at solving this problem. Suffice it to recall the recent talks between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and the U.S. Secretary of State, James Baker. Meetings of experts are being held in Moscow, Windhoek, and Washington. Our position is, he continued, that in tackling the Afghan problem it is of the utmost importance to balance the interests of all the interested sides, and attempts to exclude the government of the Republic of Afghanistan from the settlement process at any stage seem to us to be unjustified. The Government of the Republic of Afghanistan is a reality which cannot be left out of account.

It ought to be said, Ambassador Kozyrev noted in conclusion, that the world has certain expectations of the summit meeting which is to be held shortly in Washington. It is obvious that today, using Geneva as a starting point, we must move toward a full settlement in Afghanistan.

U.S. Role Seen Necessary for Peace

LD1004140890 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] April 15 will mark two years since the Geneva Accords on Afghanistan were signed. Regrettably few of the high hopes pinned on them have come true. While the Soviet Union has lived up to its pledge to pull its troops out of Afghanistan, foreign intervention in that country continues in defiance of the accords. Aleksandr Pogodin writes:

The events of the past two years call for a new assessment of the situation on the part of the signatories. Back in 1988, American and Pakistani officials insisted that every problem would find a solution as soon as the Soviets left. They implied that the Kabul government would fall within weeks if not days.

Now there are no more Soviet troops in Afghanistan, but the crisis persists. The opposition attempts to seize strategic centers have been crushed and President Najibullah resolutely put down a coup attempt by a former defense minister.

The need for a new realistic approach to the problem is evident. I will not speak about Pakistan's important role, Aleksandr Pogodin says, but dwell on the United States' attitude to Afghanistan. But instead of citing the many cases of United States interference in the Afghan confrontation, let's try and answer the crucial question: Is Washington going to change anything in its Afghan policies?

Every sensible observer is aware that war in Afghanistan can only end after America joins in the peace efforts. There have been signs of hope. Anonymous sources in Washington have been quoted as saying that the administration is searching for new concepts in Afghanistan. Such a revision has been urged by some United States senators. The issue has been raised in a series of talks with the Soviet Union, including the latest meeting between Secretary of State James Baker and the Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze. Among other things they discussed free elections in Afghanistan. The idea was put forward by President Najibullah and aroused interest in the United States.

It's too early to state anything definitely, but perhaps it will be in this direction that Moscow and Washington will find common ground on Afghanistan.

TV Correspondent Reports From Afghan Front

LD1504165790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 15 Apr 90

[By Kabul correspondent Aleksandr Shkirando, from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] [illegible] of the month of Ramadan, which is sacred for Muslims, the Afghan soil continues to quake with the explosions of bombs and shells. Our Kabul correspondent Aleksandr Shkirando reports from the scene of events.

[Shkirando] One rarely has a chance to report from the front under the conditions of civil war, but today our film group has found itself on the front line of Kabul's defense.

The main battles have developed about four kilometers from here. The rebels' positions are located there, behind the picturesque village of Paghman. They are firing on the Afghan capital with virtual impunity. Recently, however, about 150 groups of bandits, numbering up to 200,000 men, have concentrated here. Their aim is well defined: to attempt to take Kabul. In order to achieve this aim the leaders of the Peshawar Seven have thrust a new slogan upon the guerrillas: "Ya ghazi ya shahid," which means in translation "Either victor or martyr." In other words, this means for them that even if you die in the assault on Kabul, you will still get into heaven.

Well then, is there a real danger that the capital will be taken by the armed opposition?

[M.N. Mukhamat Nabi Azimi, commander of the Kabul garrison, indentified by caption—Azimi speaks in vernacular with superimposed Russian translation by announcer] The situation in the area around Kabul really is complex. There is an endless influx of weapons and ammunition arriving from Pakistan. I am, however, convinced that the irreconciliable opposition will not succeed in taking Kabul. We, too, have learned some things in more than a year of independent combat operations. [video shows Afghan Army emplacement facing a range of high mountains; a battery of D-30 122mm field guns is firing; officers are inspecting the command and targetting facilities]

Afghan Leader Airs Current Policy

LD1404164690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 14 Apr 90

[Text] Today is ithe second anniversary of the signing of the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan. As is known, the main aim of these accords was the achievement of peace in the republic and in the region as a whole. But, judging from reports coming in, evidently there is a long way to go before the establishment of peace and calm in Afghanistan. Over to our correspondent Aleksandr Shkirando:

[Shkirando] Indeed the situation in Afghanistan now is usually complicated and contradictory. I would even say that since Geneva it has deteriorated even more. I remind you that the Geneva accords were signed by the representatives of four countries: Afghanistan, Pakistan, the USSR and the United States, with our country and the United States, according to these documents, being the guarantors of the agreements. It took almost six years for the foreign ministers of the above-mentioned countries to gather in Geneva and sign these documents. Two years ago they were regarded as historic. After all, they opened up real possibilities for settling the Afghan issue. Unfortunately, their authority has remained only on paper.

Describing the situation in the country in connection with the second anniversary of the signing of the Geneva agreement, Sulayman La'eq member of the Politburo and secretary of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan [PDPA] Central Committee, said in an interview to Soviet radio: the main cause of tension in our country is that Pakistan and the United States are not only disregarding the Geneva agreements but are also continuing open interference in the internal affairs of the Republic of Afghanistan, Sulayman La'eq says. Moreover, the unsuccessful Shahnawaz-Gulbuddin conspiracy testifies to the fact that Pakistan is looking for new, even more perfidious forms of interference. Investigations in connection with the conspiracy show that it was prepared by Pakistan military intelligence. In this situation, the leadership of the Republic of Afghanistan is pursuing a policy of national reconciliation, seeing in it the sole reasonable alternative to the continuation of the senseless bloodshed. Our latest constructive proposals, in particular the holding of general elections in the country and the creation of a coalition government, are meeting with more and more support among the field commanders of the armed opposition. We are confident that if there is no interference from outside. the Afghans will be able to find a common language in order to put a stop to the fratricidal war and the destruction of the country, he said in conclusion.

Soviet POW Returns From Afghanistan

PM1504140190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4

[M. Yusin report under the rubric "We Report the Details": "Held by Mujahidin for Four Years"]

[Text] Yesterday's IZVESTIYA carried a brief report that former Soviet prisoner of war Aleksey Tikhonov had been freed in Kabul after four years in the hands of the Afghan opposition. The news agencies conveyed no additional details.

In search of more detailed information IZVESTIYA's correspondent turned to the USSR Foreign Ministry. However, he failed to discover very much. The operation to free Tikhonov was undertaken by the Afghan side, and the details of it were not yet known at the time of our conversation in Moscow. Nevertheless, a Foreign Ministry spokesman reported certain facts that were not reflected in yesterday's paragraph. These, for example: Aleksey Tikhonov is a 23-year-old Russian who lived in the Uzbek city of Dzhizak until 1985, when he was drafted into the Army. The mother of the former prisoner of war will fly out to Kabul Wednesday [11 April], and the two of them will return to the motherland within the next few days (most likely 12 April).

Far more detailed information was obtained on the morning of 11 April, when the editorial office contacted Andrey Pravovoy, APN correspondent in Kabul, who the day before had spent several hours talking with Tikhonov.

It has been established that he was captured 13 July 1986. In what circumstances? According to Aleksey himself, on that day he was standing at his post when he dozed off. On waking up, he discovered to his horror that his assault rifle, which he had probably dropped during his sleep, had vanished. Fearing punishment, Aleksey did not return to his unit and wandered off in an unknown direction. He soon stumbled upon a mujahidin detachment and was taken prisoner.

For almost four years Tikhonov was in a detachment of the well-known field commander Payanda, which is part of the most extremist opposition grouping—G. Hikmatyar's Islamic Party of Afghanistan. According to Afghan Army spokesmen, Payanda, a former butcher, is noted for his great cruelty. Operating in the southern Salang region, his people have recently refrained from large-scale battles with government troops, preferring to attack truck convoys traveling along the Hayraton-Kabul highway.

Aleksey said that agents of the Afghan Ministry of State Security who had infiltrated Payanda's detachment contacted him some time ago. They suggested that Tikhonov escape, make his way to Kabul, and then return to the motherland, where, so they said, the attitude toward prisoners of war had changed and no one intended to take reprisals against the former soldier. Tikhonov followed the advice: After leaving the mujahidin position, he walked for a long time through the mountains and finally found himself on a highway. From there he made his way on a passing bus to the nearest city, which was under the government's control. On 8 April Aleksey was brought to Kabul and two days later he was handed over to representatives of the Soviet Union.

Aleksey Tikhonov is now at the USSR Embassy. The former prisoner's health arouses no fears, but he has suffered a psychological breakdown. His plans for the future: On returning to the motherland, he dreams of acquiring a plot of land, settling there, and living alone, far from people. While in captivity he adopted Islam, and he is now continuing, at the embassy, to observe the Muslim fast and frequently cites the Koran. He does not reply to the question of whether he intends to remain in his new faith, but averts his eyes...

Commentary Analyzes Indian-Pakistani Tensions

BK1304122990 Moscow International Service in Tamil 1400 GMT 12 Apr 90

[Vladimir Ivashin Commentary]

[Text] It appears that once again tension has erupted in Indian-Pakistani relations. According to foreign news agency reports, the security forces in Pakistan are now on full alert. Plans have been drawn up to evacuate people living in areas near the Indian-Pakistani borders. In Pakistan, military deployments are being shifted closer to the Indian borders. Important military (?locations) are being shielded.

Indian Prime Minister V.P. Singh's 10 April speech in the parliament reflects concern. In his speech, he made a call to be psychologically ready for a war that may break out with Pakistan. The unresolved Kashmir issue is the root cause for such a serious turn of events. Owing to the Kashmir issue, there were armed conflicts between India and Pakistan twice in the past. The current tense situation in Kashmir may give rise to a fresh conflict. But, what is the background for the dispute between the two neighboring countries?

There are various reasons for the current emergency situation in the Jammu-Kashmir state. Of them, Pakistan's provocative actions is the most significant one. Pakistan instigates separatist tendencies and terrorist activities among the extremist Muslim groups In Kashmir. Pakistan describes such acts as its support to the Kashmiri people, who are fighting for their right to self-determination. But, how can one accept bomb blasts in Kashmir's cities, hostage taking, and the coercing of Indian security forces to use arms against rallies of peaceful citizens as the movement of the people for their right of self-determination? However, Pakistan continues to use such strategies and in trying to internationalize the Kashmir issue. For instance, during his meeting with Egyptian President Husni Mubarak in connection

with the foreign ministers meeting of the Islamic Conference Organization to be held in June this year, Pakistani Foreign Minister Sahabzada Yaqub Khan discussed the Kashmir issue.

Time and again, Pakistan has tried to raise this issue at the United Nations. It seems as though Pakistan has forgotten the fact that the United Nations has already determined about its stand on this issue through its 13 June 1948 resolution. In that resolution, the United Nations acknowledged India's rights over Kashmir. It was also agreed that the Kashmir issue is an internal Indian affair. Accordingly, the United Nations Security Council prepared a blueprint to improve Indo-Pakistani relations on the Kashmir issue. A final solution to the Kashmir issue can be achieved only through a plebiscite. But, before that, according to the UN resolution of 5 January 1949, several conditions—such as the withdrawal of Pakistani troops from the occupied areas in Kashmir, an end to acts of inciting subversive and sabotage activities in Kashmir by Pakistan, and an end to its anti-India, war-mongering propaganda—should be fulfilled. The reason for the current tension in Indo-Pakistan relations is Pakistan's violation of the UN resolutions and the 1972 Simla agreement.

There is the danger of the escalation of a military conflict between the two countries. Certain circles in Pakistan might spark a war against India to divert the attention of the people from the serious internal socioeconomic problems. The statements of the influential representatives of the Pakistani military circles, who want to the defeats suffered in the previous wars, can be understood clearly.

Is it possible to solve the current problems through a fresh conflict? The outcome of the previous wars proves that it is meaningless to try to find a military solution to any problem. It is clear that only through peaceful negotiations, by taking into consideration the interests of each other, can a solution to the current impasse be found. Otherwise, another serious regional conflict may escalate.

New Israeli Satellite Fuels Near East Arms Race

PM1104140590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Apr 90 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Belyakov report under the rubric "International Notes": "Israel: With a Rocket Against the Current"]

[Text] Cairo, 8 Apr—Israel has launched its second artificial earth satellite. On 3 April a two-stage launch vehicle with an "Ofeq-2" satellite weighing 160 kg was launched from a space center in the center of the country. It is estimated that it will remain in orbit for two years. Western specialists are convinced that this space program is being implemented for exclusively military purposes. "Ofeq-2," like its predecessor, is a spy satellite.

But this is not all. According to information in the U.S. TIME magazine, the "Shavit" rocket with whose assistance Israeli satellites are being launched into orbit, is capable of carrying a nuclear warhead. The world press has long been full of rumors about Israel's nuclear potential. A considerable number of experts believe that this potential is a reality.

Israel's switching of the arms race in the Near East to the nuclear and nuclear-space sphere cannot fail to provoke concern among the Arab states and reciprocal measures on their part. Egypt and Iraq have provided themselves with their own rockets. In December Iraq carried out tests on a launch vehicle capable of sending an artificial earth satellite into space. "Asymmetric measures," so to speak, are also being taken: Iraq, for instance, has accumulated a significant chemical weapons potential.

This development of events is not only fraught with catastrophic consequences for the Near East, but also presents a serious threat to the whole world. In the stalemate conditions in the matter of a political settlement of the Near East conflict no one can guarantee that military actions in this region will not flare up again.

Israeli Businessmen Cited on Cooperation

PM1204104590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Dispatch by special correspondent K. Geyvandov: "Many-Faced Israel; Thoughts After Trip"]

[Excerpt] Tel Aviv-Moscow—[passage omitted] Our meeting with Dan Gillerman [name as transliterated], president of the federation of chambers of commerce, took place just after he had returned from the Soviet Union after signing in Moscow a trade agreement establishing direct economic ties between the two countries.

"The date of 23 January—the day the first agreement in slightly more than 20 years was signed in the Soviet Union's Chamber of Trade and Industry—was a historic date," Gillerman told us. He described with enthusiasm how active work is under way to select people to work in the Israeli mission in Moscow, how there are already a number of specific projects for implementation, including a sphere like agriculture where the Israelis have achieved definite successes. Gillerman also believes that the Israelis' Soviet trade partners could with benefit to themselves make use of some advantages which his country has acquired on world markets. The point is that in accordance with the international agreements which Tel Aviv has, if someone from abroad supplies Israel with raw or semifinished materials which are then subjected to even 35-percent processing, they can be sold as Israeli output.

During our stay in Israel we frequently had occasion to convince ourselves of the readiness of representatives of that country's business circles to set up mutually advantageous trade and economic cooperation with us. One of these pragmatists and enthusiasts was Ofer Neyeman

[name as transliterated], acting vice president of the "Elite Industries" company, whom we were taken to visit one evening by Amos Regev [name as transliterated], editor of the news section of the newspaper YEDIOTH AHARONOTH. And a couple of days later Neyeman invited us to his firm's Tel Aviv factory and organized an interesting excursion covering the entire production cycle from chocolate to top-quality chewing gum. Then, in a conversation, the enterprise leaders who, like all businessmen, are interested in expanding the sphere of their activity, asked about the economic situation in the Soviet Union and the opportunities for business in our country. Of course, their interest was of the most practical and applied sort possible which, unfortunately, a nonspecialist could scarcely satisfy... [passage omitted]

Talks Held With Egyptian Delegation

LD1304200590 Moscow TASS in English 1922 GMT 13 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 13 TASS—"A visit to the Soviet Union enabled us to get a better idea of changes in this country and to reach agreement on measures to consolidate Soviet-Arab relations." Ahmed Hamrush, chairman of the Egyptian Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Committee, said at a press conference here today. The committee's delegation is visiting the USSR at the invitation of the USSR Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Committee.

After arriving in the USSR, the delegation handed over to the Soviet Peace Foundation a batch of disposable syringes and catheters. This is the committee's contribution to the Chernobyl charity telemarathon, due to be held in the USSR on April 26.

During the delegation's visit to Moscow a number of agreements were reached concerning further deepening of contacts between the Soviet Union and Arab states. Specifically, it is planned to hold a Soviet-Arab dialogue in Moscow from June 4 to 6, 1990, in which prominent politicians and public figures from the USSR and Arab countries will take part. The sides discussed the possibility of publishing the AZIA I AFRIKA journal in Arabic.

Responding to a TASS question about the emigration problem and the settlement of Jews on Israeli-occupied lands, Mohammed Fayek, secretary general of the Arab Human Rights Organisation, said that "the right to emigrate is the right of every individual, but it should not be exercised at the expense of humiliating other people. This is what Israel is doing."

"In the Middle East all Arab countries joined the campaign to create a nuclear-free zone in the region. Israel is the only country in the Middle East which possesses nuclear weapons, but does not wish to disarm," said Mohammed al-Zayad, chairman of the People's Assembly Commission on Arab Issues.

Iran-Saudi Dispute Over Hajj Quota Analyzed

NC1404122990 Moscow in Persian to Iran at 1100 GMT 14 Apr 90

[Yuriy Andreyev commentary from "The World Today" program]

[Text] Dear listeners: As has been reported, in recent days 140 deputies of the Iranian parliament issued an open letter in which they called on the Islamic world to exert pressure on Saudi Arabia with regard to that country's attitude toward the Hajj. The Majles deputies asked Riyadh to abolish the restrictions it has placed on Iranian Muslims for the pilgrimage to Mecca. Our commentator Yuriy Andreyev writes the following:

It was believed that during the whole history of the Muslim world, the Hajj was some sort of symbol of Islamic unity and above politics. But in recent times the Hajj has often ceased to be merely a religious act, and has frequently been the object of sharp political disputes. Some even claim that today it has turned more into the symbol of the Muslims' conflicts. This time, too, the issue of the Hajj is being exploited for mere political purposes.

On 11 April, 140 Iranian Majles deputies issued an open letter in Tehran that contains serious attacks against the Saudi Arabian Government. Foremost of all, the deputies requested the abolition of any quotas on the visit of Muslims to Mecca. As is known, several years ago Riyadh placed restrictive quotas on pilgrims from all Muslim countries during the Hajj ceremonies. At that time, the Saudi Arabian Government spokesman announced that his country could not receive a flood of several million pilgrims and ensure the conditions for their normal living and security. This year, too, specific quotas have been set. For example, there is a quota of 45,000 for Iran. Meanwhile, the Iranian Majles deputies have categorically rejected this figure, alleging in their letter that this year Saudi Arabia can receive 150,000 Iranian pilgrims. The Iranian parliament's members called on Riyadh to admit officially, the facts about the massacre of the pilgrims in Mecca and pay compensation to the relatives of the deceased. It should be recalled that in 1987 bloody clashes took place in Mecca as a result of which 402 pilgrims, most of whom were Iranians, were killed while an anti-U.S. demonstration was being dispersed.

For its part, Saudi Arabia believes that Tehran is trying to exploit the Hajj for its own malicious political aims. In the opinion of the Saudi Arabian Government, such a policy results in the perpetration of ongoing terrorist acts during the Hajj ceremonies. Meanwhile, Riyadh invokes the incidents that took place during last year's Hajj. At that time, extremists set off two bombs near the Ka'ba, which resulted in the death of one pilgrim and the injury of 16 others. A group of Kuwaiti nationals, most of whom were of Iranian origin, were charged with this crime, and all were executed.

It is abundantly clear that this campaign of coercion and mutual recrimination has less to do with religious problems. There is a strong likelihood that the issue is about the overt confrontation between Iran and Saudi Arabia, which has quite deep roots. For some time now, Tehran and Riyadh have been rivals in the Islamic world and are waging a struggle to reinforce their influence in the countries of the Persian Gulf and the Middle East.

The letter by the 140 Majles deputies has apparently opened a new round in the propaganda war between Iran and Saudi Arabia, whose political confrontation is entering a new stage.

Anreyev Commentary on Iran's Urban Congestion

NC1204140790 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1100 GMT 12 Apr 90

[Yuriy Andreyev commentary]

[Text] Dear listeners: Some time ago, Mr. Abolqasem Jamshidi, head of the Iran Statistics Center [ISC], announced some of the latest figures on the situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran. I intend to refer to one salient point only in the detailed remarks of Mr. Jamshidi, which encompassed most of the vital aspects of Iranian life. Yuriy Andreyev writes in this regard:

As can be gleaned from the speech by the head of the ISC, Iran is gradually metamorphosing into a country of urban dwellers. At present 30 million people live in the cities. The number of rural residents is only 25 million. In all, the country has 504 cities. Tehran, Tabriz, Mashhad, Shiraz, and Esfahan are the largest, and in these one fifth of the country's population is concentrated.

Well, what is the reason for this major migration of people from the rural areas?

There are various reasons. For example, foremost in the trend toward increasing urbanization in general is the desire to take part in contemporary and industrial civilization. It is understandable that, in these conditions, the cities should be transformed into centers of civilization. However, in Iran, there are special reasons for the swift expansion of urbanization. First of all, there is the issue of land, which remains unresolved. Since the downfall of the monarchical Pahlavi regime, land reforms have still not yet taken place. As a result most of the tillers of the soil are not owners of the land or have very small tracts of land, which do not provide them with a sufficient livelihood for their families.

The extremely penurious state of a vast majority of the farmers has aggravated the situation. In the rural areas of Iran, the average standard of living of 72 percent of families is lower than the officially specified minimum. As a result, the migration of farmers to the cities increases.

Well, what are the dimensions of this continuing trend?

This trend is intensifying, relatively speaking. Suffice it to say that according to the remarks by Mr. Jamshidi, in the course of the past three years the number of city dwellers has increased by 4 million. For example, the population of the capital has risen to 7 million.

What effect has this rapid increase in the urban population had on the country's economic situation?

The effect has not been very positive. First of all, the increase has generated a series of very difficult social problems. For example, the housing in cities is inadequate. Shanty towns are mushrooming, crime and debt are mounting, and so on. In addition, the increase in urban dwellers raises the unemployment level. For example, according to the remarks by Mr. Jamshidi, 2 million people are unemployed in the country at present. However, according to independent expert estimates, the true number is considerably higher. Meanwhile, those who migrate to the cities are without any particular skills. This tangibly exacerbates the situation. In fact, the government intends to provide an additional 390,000 more jobs annually. This was also planned in the past, but the unemployment level continued to rise.

In short, the increase in urbanization demands a cautious approach.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Aid for African Countries To Be Reviewed

LD1504105290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1920 GMT 13 Apr 90

[Interview with Yu. Yukalov, head of the African Countries Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Aleksandr Ivanov, first secretary of the directorate; and Yuriy Merzlyakov, head of department in the directorate, with journalists A. Lyubimov and A. Shipilov, on board an aircraft during Shevardnadze's March 1990 tour of Africa—recorded; from the "View" program]

[Text] [Shipilov] We have to review our policy of providing aid to the African countries, particularly since the very fact of such aid is giving rise to quite a lot of tension within the country itself. On the other hand we bear a kind of moral responsibility for those countries that have in effect followed us along our path.

[Yukalov] You know, it is not even a matter of moral responsibility. I think you have phrased the question wrongly. After all, we have always been imposing something on someone and ended up responsible, as it were, for what we imposed. If there is to be freedom of choice, everyone must choose and develop himself. He himself bears responsibility for his own choice. Yes, we feel pangs of conscience for things that have been done in the past. The extent to which these things were wrong is a vexed question. I think that we must approach it in a sensible manner. Maybe we should look again at what we

did in developing countries and in Africa, in particular, in 20 or 30 years' time. After all, not everything we did there was bad.

[Shipilov] What is the volume of our military aid to Africa now?

[Yukalov] Well, you know, this all depends on which countries you are talking about. Our military aid to countries where the fate of so-called Marxist regimes hung in the balance at one time, to countries subjected to external aggression, is very great. It is abnormally large by comparison with normal economic, technical, and even scientific assistance, and assistance in the training of national cadres. Of course, there is an enormous imbalance here. But, you know, this is also a reflection of the world situation as it was at that time. It is easy to look at it now and say, Oh, everything was wrong. But the situation in the world at that time was based on confrontation and military stand-off. We tried to help our friends to survive.

[Video shows another part of the aircraft, where a correspondent is interviewing another official, identified by caption as Aleksandr Ivanov, first secretary of the Africa Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry]

[Ivanov] As far as Angola is concerned, the idea was actively put about that the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola bases its work on Marxist-Leninist ideology. It was perhaps difficult to understand where we got this last idea from. A certain section, especially the well-off people, faced the real threat of nationalization and the loss of everything they had worked for during their lives. Things are probably moving somewhat in the opposite direction now. In 1985 the government drew up a program of economic and financial reform. The implementation of this program began in 1987. Their ideas on the liberalization of the economy are somewhat similar to our new economic plan.

[Lyubimov] Can one say that the Brezhnev doctrine also had an influence on our relations with Africa?

[Ivanov] I do not think this is simply the Brezhnev doctrine. I think this is what we can call the Comintern approach. On the one hand, we used to say that our policy never was a policy of exporting revolution. But in practice it was, to a considerable extent.

[Video: in another part of the aircraft a correspondent interviews an official identified by caption as Yuriy Merzlyakov, head of department in the Africa Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry]

[Correspondent] Did the results of the meeting with De Klerk match up to your expectations?

[Merzlyakov] On the whole, yes. If you take the purely African aspect, the African angle, I think we get it right, if not all the time, then most of the time.

[Correspondent] Are you working on certain moves in the talks?

[Merzlyakov] No, the task is far more narrow and simple, I would say. In actual fact, everything was prepared in Moscow. Here my job is to make a record of the most important talks and then to prepare materials for the report.

[Shipilov] During the visit there was a meeting with De Klerk, the South African leader. [Video shows Shevardnadze shaking hands with De Klerk] What are the chances for the establishment of diplomatic relations? After all, he is a reformer.

[Yukalov] Let us begin at the end. The establishment of diplomatic relations is, of course, unrealistic at the present time because, at the end of the day, our policies are based on ethnic considerations. I would put it this way. Until the movement toward eliminating apartheid becomes irreversible, we will naturally not be establishing diplomatic relations with South Africa. We are maintaining contacts and a dialogue. That is a normal thing to do.

De Sousa Comments on Angola Independence Talks

Outlines Base for Peace

LD1604203990 Moscow in Portuguese to Africa 1800 GMT 15 Apr 90

[Text] As we have already reported, Angolan President Jose Eduardo dos Santos has declared that his government will hold direct talks with the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola [UNITA]. We interviewed Manuel Bernardo de Sousa, Angolan ambassador-at-large in the USSR, who has just returned from Luanda. We asked him to comment on this event.

[Begin recording] Distinguishing this from the first phase [of the peace talks], whose essential initial points are reflected in the Gbadolite Accord of 22 June 1988, and whose implementation was sabotaged by the active interference of the United States in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of Angola [PRA], by the political instability of some African states over the Angolan internal conflict and the ways of resolving to it, as well as UNITA leader Jonas Savimbi himself, the present peace phase has particular characteristics which may be seen through the following important regional and international events.

First, we have the continuing phased withdrawal of Cuban troops from the PRA on the basis of the December 1988 New York Accords under the UN Transition Assistance Group's supervision; then the complete withdrawal of South African troops from Angolan territory in the initial process of political democratization being implemented by President de Klerk in South Africa; Then SWAPO's election victory and the independence of Namibia; Reduced tension in international political relations and the creation of a climate favorable to the peaceful resolution of global and regional conflicts, etc., Through dialogue, thanks to the reforms under way today in the socialist countries of Eastern

Europe, mainly the USSR in the sphere of foreign and internal policy. We then have the victory of the Angolan Government Army at the battle of Mavinga against UNITA's military forces, which, on the one hand, showed the military capability of the Angolan Army and on the other, weakened UNITA's military forces, and sharpened the contradictions in UNITA's leadership. We do not want to stress that the end of the Angolan internal conflict will necessarily be through military action [word indistinct] peaceful settlement (?through) dialogue between the two warring sides. This would be absurd and would show a lack of political vision on the part of the Angolan Government.

Generally, it is this set of objective factors which will specifically mark the beginning of the new phase in the Angolan internal peace process, mainly because of the existence of the necessary conditions for direct talks between the Angolan Government and UNITA on the basis of the new peace project put forward by the Angolan Government. I refer to the reduction of interference in the internal affairs of the Angolan state as a sovereign and independent state. We have received one piece of news—that UNITA, in a statement by its government, and its institutions, and its willingness to negotiate for ways to resolving the angolan internal conflict. [passage indistinct]. We hope that this time UNITA will really be aware of the responsibility it should assume in adopting this stance. [end recording]

Talks Renewed

MB1404102590 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 13 Apr 90

[Text] As we have already reported, President Jose Eduardo dos Santos of Angola has said that his government is ready for a direct dialogue with the UNITA grouping. We asked Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the People's Republic of Angola in the Soviet Union, Manuel Bernardo de Sousa, who has just returned from Luanda, to comment. This is what he said.

[Begin De Sousa recording in Portuguese fading into English translation] The present stage of peaceful settlement in Angola has several specific features, as compared to the stage that has begun in Gbadolite on 22 June of last year. As is known, this agreement was broken as a result of the U.S. interference in the internal affairs of our country; the unclear position of some African countries concerning the ways of the settlement in Angola; and also as a result of the actions of the UNITA leader, Jonas Savimbi.

The present initiative of the Angolan leadership appeared as a result of several events that occurred both on the international arena and the South African region. What are those events?

First of all, I'd like to note the subsequent withdrawal of Cuban forces from the territory of Angola, based on the New York agreements of 22 December 1988, and taking place under the UNTAG [UN Transition Assistance Group] control. On the other hand, South Africa has already withdrawn its troops from Angola and President de Klerk has started a policy directed at the democratization of the internal life of South Africa.

An important event is also the victory of SWAPO [South-West Africa People's Organization] in the elections in Namibia, and the recent proclamation of independence of that country. Due to the policy of reforms in the Soviet Union and East Europe and changes in their internal policy, a climate favorable to the peaceful solution of the conflict in various regions of the planet has set in, and there is a lessening of tension on the international arena.

The victory of the armed forces of Angola over the UNITA forces near the city of Mavinga is also a considerable event. This battle has demonstrated in its turn the military power of the Angolan Army and, on the other hand, has weakened the position of UNITA and sharpened the contradictions in the ranks of its leadership. However, I don't want to say that the solution of the internal Angolan conflict is possible only as a result of the armed actions. On the contrary, the dialogue between the MPLA [Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola] and UNITA is necessary, and the search for ways of renewing this dialogue demonstrates the political far-sightedness of the Angolan leadership.

The circumstances I have mentioned made possible the working out of new peaceful proposals of the leadership of the People's Republic of Angola—have created a situation for the renewal of talks on the peaceful settlement in Angola—because the pressure from without, the external interference in the affairs of our sovereign and independent country, have considerably lessened.

We have information that the Political Bureau of UNITA has come out with a statement which says that it recognizes the political institutions of the Angolan state, recognizes the present Angolan Government, and is ready to begin talks with it, talks directed at working out a peaceful solution of the conflict. It became known that the dialogue will evidently begin on 16 April in Lisbon or in Cape Verde. We hope that the UNITA delegation will this time show a responsible approach to the dialogue and hold a consistent position at the talks. [end recording]

Ethiopian Peace Talks in Sanaa Viewed

EA1104124890 Moscow International Service in Amharic 1530 GMT 8 Apr 90

[Text] Vladimir Borisov comments on the talks in North Yemen: Four Eritrean opposition groups agreed to hold preliminary peace talks with the Ethiopian Government. The largest of the four is the Eritrean Liberation Front [ELF], which was formed at the beginning of the 60s. The aim of the meeting, which began in Sanaa last Sunday, was to stop the bloodshed in Eritrea, it was reported officially.

Although the news of the progress of the meeting is not satisfactory, it is relevant to look at the following points: First, the meeting attracted a lot of attention because it was called at short notice. The holding of talks was announced when the talks between the TPLF [Tigray People's Liberation Front] and the Ethiopian Government in Rome had failed, and when the refusal of the EPLF [Eritrean People's Liberation Front] to attend the Nairobi talks had become known. Under these circumstances, opposition parties which are rivals of the EPLf agreed to hold talks with the Addis Ababa government. This shows that there is division and conflict between the opposition secessionists.

There are (?valid) reasons for these divisions. In the first place, political contradictions between the secessionists are becoming sharper. Since the formation of the secessionist groups, over the last 30 years there have been misunderstandings and quarrels between the conservatives and left-wing radicals. In addition, there are religious conflicts. In the ELF and a few other parties, Muslim members are more numerous, and their views on the future of Eritrea tend to be conservative.

In the EPLF, there are more Christians. Until recently, they have been claiming to be Marxists. As a result of the difference in political views during the early 70's, the EPLF became an independent body. It is well known that this front is in conflict with the ELF, and is currently spearheading the struggle against the Ethiopian central government.

Whatever the aim and agenda of the peace talks may be, the ELF and the other Muslim parties represented at the talks will obviously want to gain prestige through these meetings. If that is so, there are no satisfactory conditions for bringing peace to northern Ethiopia. Therefore, even if the talks succeed, I doubt whether they can bring a lasting solution to the conflict, the commentator says.

However, any agreement reached at the talks, from which the self-styled EPLF, the major opposition group, has been absent, and which it may think it has undermined, will further increase the divisions among the Eritrean secessionists and make more difficult the search for a peaceful solution involving each group. This raises the question: Has the Ethiopian Government properly understood this situation? It seems me that it has understood it. However, it cannot reject reconciliation with the ELF, because it has disclosed its readiness for a peaceful reconciliation with the various opposition groups. But what makes the government hold talks of this kind? Is it because it could not say no, or does it hope to put pressure on the strong rival organization, that is, the EPLF?

According to one source from the region, the Ethiopian Air Force carried out intensive bombing of two Eritrean towns last Thursday [5 April], which were under the control of the EPLF secessionists.

Drought, Fighting in Northern Ethiopia Reported

EA0804191090 Moscow International Service in Amharic 1530 GMT 5 Apr 90

[Maksim Yevgenyev commentary]

[Text] War, starvation, and drought have become Ethiopia's current and main features. Whenever one thinks of Ethiopia, one thinks of war, starvation, and drought. Therefore, there have been few occasions when the world's mass media have failed to mention Ethiopia's current internal and external situation. The third round of peace talks held in rome between the Ethiopian Government and the Tigray People's Liberation Front delegates broke down without result.

Talks have been started with another group, the Eritrean Liberation Front [ELF], in the North Yemen capital, Sanaa. The aim is to find a peaceful solution to the 30-year-old civil war and to end the bloodshed in Eritrea. There are four fronts, with secessionist aims in the ELF delegation. Most of them are Muslims. The major front, the Eritrean People's Liberation Front [EPLF], which has been scoring continuous victories over the Ethiopian Government forces, will not participate in the Sanaa talks. Therefore, many observers openly say that any talks concerning Eritrea in which this group does not participate will not bring military and political stability to northern Ethiopia.

Foreign news sources confirm, that the situation in northern Ethiopia is slipping from the government's control. The town of Asmera and its environs, which are under the control of the government, are besieged by EPLF fighters. The fact that the port of Mitsiwa is under their control has aggravated the situation more. In the Ethiopian Government-controlled areas, routes for delivering foodstuffs and arms to the Army have been virtually cut off. Only airlines are operating, and even then they are unable to bring food and other necessities to the military and civilians.

There is a shortage of electricity, fuel, and food in Asmera. The worst affected are the drought victims. The international community has repeatedly called on the warring parties to stop the fighting so that food can be given to the hungry. This call has been heeded, and some truck carrying food aid have gone to the drought-affected areas. Church and nongovernmental aid organizations are delivering the relief aid. However, foreign aid is only temporary relief for Ethiopia, it cannot be permanent. The problems of drought and economic growth can only be solved by peaceful and political means.

Namibia's Upcoming UN Membership Examined

MB1204163290 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 11 Apr 90

[Vladimir Valentinov commentary—read by announcer]

[Text] No one doubts that Namibia will become the 160th member of the United Nations organization.

The thing is not that the president of the young Republic, Sam Nujoma, in his letter addressed to the UN secretary general, assures his country will strictly abide by the obligations contained in the Charter of that prestigious international organization, though that, too, is important. It's simply that Namibia, for a long time already, enjoys the patronage and protection of this world community organization.

It was the United Nations that in 1966 deprived South Africa of the mandate to control the territory of Namibia and placed it under its trusteeship. It was the United Nations that headed the struggle on a world scale for granting Namibia independence, having founded the specialized coordinating body, the UN Council on Namibia—by the way, today its last meeting in Windhoek is ending.

And, finally, it is the UN's plan on the decolonization of Namibia that's formed the basis of the process of granting it independence and, under United Nations control, is being successfully implemented.

To me, the United Nations is a sort of a guarantor of the achievements of not only the political but also of the economic, social, and cultural independence of the young country. Taking into consideration the big difficulties that Namibia had to undergo, the United Nations took under its control the large-scale program of aid to the Republic on the part of the international community.

A UN center was opened in Windhoek, where the UN secretary general, Perez de Cuellar, and the foreign minister of Namibia, the former permanent representative of the SWAPO [South-West African People's Organization] in the United Nations, Theo-Ben Gurirab, signed the agreement on [word indistinct] cooperation between the United Nations and Namibia. The representations of the UN Program of Development, the UN Children's Fund, the UN Food and Agricultural Organization, the World Organization of Health Care, UNESCO, and the UN World Food Program are housed in that center.

At a press conference that took place after the inauguration of the United Nations Center, Perez de Cuellar noted that Namibia must become an example of democracy, of free will of the people, and economic prosperity for all developing countries. He called on the international community to render aid to Namibia in the solution of serious economic problems facing the country, in the consolidation of political stability and the establishment of democracy.

Many countries which recognized the Republic in the first days of independence, including in the USSR, responded to the appeal of the United Nations secretary general.

Namibia is again trying to become a full-fledged 160th member of the United Nations organization. This news was received with approval by the international community.

It goes without saying that what remains are only some necessary formalities.

East Europe

'Vremya' Interviews GDR's Lothar de Maiziere

LD1404195190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 14 Apr 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Our correspondent in Berlin has interviewed Lothar de Maiziere, the leader of the GDR Christian Democrats and the republic's prime minister-elect. Lothar de Maiziere is 50 years old. He is a musician by speciality and, until recently, he worked as a lawyer. Lothar de Maiziere is expected to make a government statement on Thursday [19 April] in the GDR People's Chamber.

[Begin recording] [De Maiziere, in German with superimposed Russian translation] In my view, people in our country expect that we shall now work very purpo efully and single-mindedly on treaties with the Federal Republic of Germany concerning such areas as currency union as well as an economic and social union. The point at issue here will be primarily to achieve treaties which will preserve the social interests of GDR citizens to the maximum degree. These treaties with the FRG are, of course, an integral part of what comes under the overall concept of the process of the unification of the German states. This relates not just to the economic sphere but also to the foreign economic sphere and the European process.

[Correspondent Mostovoy, identified by screen caption] What is your attitude to the proposal by USSR Foreign Minister Shevardnadze that a united Germany should, at a certain stage, be both a member of NATO and a member of the Warsaw Pact?

[De Maiziere] I think this is probably the most complex foreign policy aspect linked with German unification. In the course of the talks which I have held in recent days with my coalition partners it was stated perfectly clearly that we proceed from the premise that the territory of the GDR cannot become a zone of operations for NATO troops after the unification process.

[Mostovoy] How do you see the development of relations in the near future between the Soviet Union and the GDR?

[De Maiziere] It would be the greatest mistake in the course of the process of the unification of the German states to reject the existing developed links between our countries. The GDR's econmy depends to a decisive degree upon the stability of treaty relations with the Soviet Union and the very same assessment is reached from the point of view of West German economists and specialists. [end recording]

First Steps of New GDR Government Studied

PM1704101590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Apr 90 Second Edition p 7

[Dispatch by own correspondent M. Podklyuchnikov under the "From the Scene of Events" rubric: "Squaring the Circle. Who Are the Members of the New GDR Government?"]

[Text] Berlin—The GDR once again has a functioning coalition government. During the second session of the People's Chamber the prime minister—it is Lothar de Maiziere, chairman of the Christian Democratic Union—and 23 members of his cabinet were confirmed.

The H. Modrow government, which was inaugurated 18 November of last year, has laid down its powers. Everyone recognizes that it has merited the people's gratitude. It fell to that cabinet's lot to steer the ship of state through the political storms which were rocking the country. It succeeded in discharging its task with honor.

So who occupies key posts in the government? Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Internal Affairs is Peter-Michael Distel from the German Social Union (he is regarded as the most reactionary figure in the "Alliance for Germany" team); Markus Meckel, acting chairman of the SPD [Social Democratic Party of Germany], has been approved as foreign minister; and the Ministry of Economics is headed by Gerhard Pohl, of the "Christian Democrats"...

The new GDR Government, commentators note, must be the only government in the world which has set itself the aim to remain in power for the shortest time possible. It sees the purpose of its activities in ensuring that the unification process of the two German states is effected as quickly as possible and ends with the disappearance of the GDR from the map of Europe.

In this context, a question had to be tackled at the session of the People's Chamber which could be compared with the notorious task of squaring the circle. The new premier and his entire cabinet had to swear the oath of loyalty to the country's Constitution, as is the custom in all democratic states. However, for them this proved an insurmountable obstacle—how can you promise to observe something that you want to bury as quickly as possible. After heated arguments the chamber adopted a compromise solution by a majority of votes: The ministers swore to observe "the laws and rule of law in the GDR."

A government statement had not been drawn up in time for the present session. The coalition negotiations during which participants had to find a common denominator for their views had taken up too much time—a week and a half. However, an agreement on the establishment of a grand coalition was drawn up at the last moment nonetheless.

The coalition agreement—a bulky document running into 50 typescript pages—provides a picture of how the new GDR Government sees the main spheres of its activity. The agreement contains an unequivocal answer to the fundamental question of how the unification of the two German states is to be achieved: The unification must take place on the basis of Article 23 of the Fundamental Law of the FRG. In other words, the GDR grand coalition favors the absorption of its country by the Federal Republic, or as some journalists ironically put it, the establishment of a "Greater FRG."

The coalition participants are expressing themselves in favor of "the process of German unification fitting into the framework of the all-European process." However, at the same time a thesis which could complicate the elaboration of the conditions for unification under international law has been put forward. The coalition partners have declared that until an all-European security system has been created, the united Germany must be a member of NATO. The categorical nature of this statement is causing puzzlement. Are the present political leaders of the GDR really unaware of the viewpoint of the Soviet Union which regards this idea as unacceptable?

During these complex times for Soviet people, every word that is spoken in Berlin on the subject of mutual relations between the GDR and the USSR, between the German and the Soviet peoples, assumes particular importance. Therefore I would like to quote from a resolution which was endorsed by all the parliamentary parties and read out by Sabine Bergmann-Pohl, president of the People's Chamber. "We," it says, "have not forgotten the terrible suffering inflicted by Germans on people in the Soviet Union during World War II. The violence which ensued from Germany ultimately also hit our people. We want to intensively continue the process of the reconciliation of our peoples. It will therefore be our concern to integrate Germany in an All-European security system to ensure that our peoples are guaranteed peace and security in the future. We are aware that the changes in our country would not have been possible without the new thinking and perestroyka in the Soviet Union."

Let us take note of this expression of good will.

The streets of Berlin and other GDR cities are full of trucks with West German license plates which are delivering West German goods to the trade network. The free market, demonstrating both flexibility and brazenness, is waging its "Blitzkrieg" in the East. The goods are sold for GDR marks but at exorbitant prices. Customers look at the goods and at the prices, and shaking their heads depart again. What do they stand to gain from the abundance of goods flooding in from abroad—prosperity or loss of jobs and earnings?

Punishment of Corrupt CPCZ Officials Viewed

LD1304153790 Moscow International Service in Czech 1700 GMT 12 Apr 90

["Neglecting the Humanitarian Approach". "Feuilleton" by observer Valentin Aleksandrov—read by announcer]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] I, and not only I, am well aware of the names of several prominent Communists who voluntarily departed from life under the influence of moral pressure on the part of certain Civic Forum activists, which is difficult to describe. Please, try to understand in a correct way. I would not like, and do not even have moral right to describe former Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] leadership and some party officials as naive lambs. On their conscience lies a harsh directive-bureaucratic system that was surpressing even the smallest possible shoots of true democracy and different thinking. On their conscience lies the abuse of power and repressions, not to mention embezzlement of state property and corruption. They are undoubtedly guilty and deserve to be punished. Yes, to be punished, but on the basis of court proceedings, just as is provided by a democratic law-governed state. At the same time, the unlawful persecution of people solely for their membership in the Communist Party has unusually grown. The Civic Forum leadership is even trying—alas, without much success—to calm excessively active officials. For example, Petr Pithart was forced to state in one of his speeches that not all communists are bad and that not all Civic Forum activists are good.

However, the persecution, which is not directly obvious, goes on. Will it lead to fresh losses of life and fresh suicides? This possibility exists. [passage omitted]

Was there at least one person in Czechoslovakia who would be prosecuted according to Paragraph 226 of the Penal Code? I personally know nothing about it. I repeat, I do not oppose the so-called communists who are guilty of various crimes being called to account. Yes, this certainly should happen, but on the basis of law and of a court ruling. I stand against revenge and vendettas, which are not a credit to any nation.

West Europe

Shevardnadze Welcomes Italy's De Michelis Visit

LD1704083590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0430 GMT 17 Apr 90

[Text] Gianni de Michelis, the Italian foreign minister, has arrived in Moscow on a working visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government. This is what Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, our country's foreign minister, said in this connection at a meeting with a group of Soviet journalists.

[Begin Shevardnadze recording] We are beginning talks with the Italian minister who, by the way, is a very interesting person. He is originally, by profession a chemist, he was previously engaged in all [word indistinct] industrial affairs; he grew up in youth organizations. He is a person interested in music, sports, and so on, but recently he has been engaged in diplomacy. He is an original thinker, and I think that these talks will be good, moreover since already, especially after Mikhail Sergeyevich's trip—our relations with the Italians went onto a new stage, a new level. We have already worked on many projects, they are being implemented. It must be said that the Italians are acting more boldly than anyone; very, very boldly and very persistently. For this reason they are in the leading position, so to speak, in economic scientific and technical cooperation; for this reason we have given great significance to the contacts with the Italian minister. Mikhail Sergeyevich will receive him in the afternoon.

We have a special relationship with Italy; we can already talk about this. A good, trusting relationship has been underlined and there is a large sphere of agreement on many questions regarding Europe and world affairs, the Near East, and other questions, the Horn of Africa. We have a very good basis for cooperation, it is true, on many issues. [end recording]

Shevardnadze, De Michelis Hold Talks

LD1704080390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 17 Apr 90

[Text] Talks have begun in the USSR Foreign Ministry between Shevardnadze, USSR Minister of foreign affairs, and De Michelis, the Italian foreign minister. The visitor arrived in the Soviet capital yesterday for a working visit which will continue until Wednesday. The state of and prospects for the further development of the whole range of bilateral relations are being discussed from the point of view of fulfilling the accords reached during Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visit to Italy last year. An exchange of opinions is underway on topical problems of the current situation in Europe and the world.

As a TASS diplomatic correspondent was informed in the USSR Foreign Ministry, particular attention will be devoted to the question of the unification of the two German states. It is expected that at the end of the talks an agreement will be signed by the governments of the USSR and Italy on cultural cooperation between the two countries.

Vorontsov, Gubenko Meet De Michelis

LD1604152690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1421 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, 16 Apr (TASS)—Italian Foreign Minister Gianni de Michelis, who is in Moscow on a working visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government, had a conversation today with USSR Minister of Culture Nikolay Gubenko.

They discussed the state of and prospects for Soviet-Italian cultural cooperation. The sides expressed interest in the further development and intensification of such cooperation. They also looked into certain other practical issues concerning mutual contacts.

The same day the Italian visitor had a meeting with Nikolay Vorontsov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Protection of the Environment.

French Army Chief To Meet Military Leaders

LD1604084290 Moscow TASS in English 0819 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 16 TASS—By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy:

Chief of staff of the French Armed Forces Army General Maurice Schmitt will arrive here today for an official 5-day visit.

The guest's agenda includes meetings and talks with top Soviet military leaderships, visits to the Soviet General Staff Academy, the Kubinbka Air Force Garrison near Moscow and the Ryazan Higher Air-Borne Forces Command School. Schmitt will see Moscow's historical and cultural places and will pay military honours to fliers of the "Mormandie-Neman" air regiment and to the unknown soldier at the Kremlin Wall.

Schmitt will round off his visit by a trip to the Black Sea town of Sevastopol. He will call on one of the warships of the Black Sea Navy and will see the sights of the Crimea.

Moiseyev Meets With Schmitt

LD1704082790 Moscow TASS in English 0805 GMT 17 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 17 TASS—"Soviet-French dialogue, including in the military sphere, got a new boost during Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to France last year," Soviet General Staff Chief Mikhail Moiseyev told TASS today, commenting on talks with his French counterpart Maurice Schmitt.

Schmitt is visiting the Soviet Union on an official visit.

The foundation for current Soviet-French relations in the military sphere had been laid during Gorbachev's visit to France, he said.

The following exchange of visits by Soviet and French defence ministers moved relations between the two countries into a new gear.

"General Schmitt and I have begun looking for concrete steps to promote understanding between the Soviet Union and France in the military sphere," Moiseyev said.

"We have forged good business contacts and have promising plans for the future," he said.

Dumas Advises French Rightists on Lithuania

PM1004164790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Apr 90 Second Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Bolshakov dispatch: "'Don't Add Fuel to the Flames'"]

[Text] Paris, April—In the French National Assembly a routine session was in progress. In the traditionally half-empty chamber ministers and other members of the government were answering deputies' questions.

Deputy F. de Villiers of the "Union for French Democracy" [UDF] bloc of right-wing parties rose to his feet. He reported that in the morning of 4 April a "message from Mr. Landsbergis" had been received from Lithuania and had been passed to the UDF parliamentary group by "his personal representative in France, who honors us by his presence in this chamber." At these words all the right-wing deputies rose to their feet to salute the "personal representative" with a unanimous ovation, and, to shouts of "Stand up!", left-wing deputies also began to rise.

Taken aback by this turn of events, National Assembly Speaker L. Fabius announced that he had not been notified of the presence of "Mr. Landsbergis' representative." But since he is here, L. Fabius said, I welcome him on behalf of the National Assembly.

Later I managed to clarify through the National Assembly press service that the person referred to as "Landsbergis' personal representative" is a Mr. Bakis, but unfortunately nobody was able to tell me who he is and how he came to be in France. His presence in the French parliament was no coincidence, however. Judging from De Villiers' account, Landsbergis' letter stated that Soviet tanks were allegedly on the point of storming the Lithuanian parliament and that France should immediately give Lithuania political support.

In his question De Villiers demanded that the government give an answer on what it is doing for the establishment of Lithuania's independence and whether it is prepared to officially recognize it and give it the right to open its own political mission in Paris. De Villiers also urged the French Government to offer its services as a mediator in "easing the tension between Lithuania and the Soviet Union"—as if this were not one of the Soviet republics but a foreign state which has come into conflict with the USSR—and also to facilitate "Lithuania's entry into all international organizations under UN auspices."

It is not difficult to realize that De Villiers' actions are aimed at winning popularity among his voters. This is how French Foreign Minister R. Dumas assessed his bad behavior when answering his question.

R. Dumas explained France's official position on Lithuania. It is based on the premise that its entry into the USSR was never officially recognized by Paris.

Thus, for Paris, the question of whether or not to recognize Lithuania's independence has long since been decided. But here, too, not everything is as simple as it appears from the right-wing opposition benches. R. Dumas recalled that in September 1944 the provisional government—which, incidentally, was headed by no means by Socialists but by Gaullists—handed Soviet representatives the keys to the Lithuanian Embassy in Paris. Lithuanian's entry into the USSR was thereby recognized . "It is impossible to ignore 50 years of

history," R. Dumas said. "Or the fact that today Russians, Poles, and Germans also live in Lithuania in addition to Lithuanians." R. Dumas reported that literally a few days earlier he had been personally assured in Moscow that the USSR Government does not intend to use force in Lithuania. And he advised those who are fueling passions over "tanks surrounding the Lithuanian parliament" "not to add fuel to the flames, especially as this will lead nowhere." Useful advice.

Latin America & Caribbean

Abalkin Optimistic About Soviet-Cuban Ties

PM1704081790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Apr 90 Second Edition p 5

[Dispatch by own correspondent A. Moiseyev: "Cuba: An Equal Partner?"]

[Text] Havana, 12 Apr—The 20th session of the Soviet-Cuban Intergovernmental Commission on Economic, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation opened here today. A delegation headed by L.I. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, has arrived from Moscow to take part in the talks.

Here in Cuba, special importance is being attached to this meeting. In my opinion, this approach is connected with the fact that the 20th session of the intergovernmental commission is taking place at a difficult moment for both sides from the economic viewpoint. It is expected that the state of our collaboration will be carefully analyzed.

"We know each other well and we have much experience in cooperation," L.I. Abalkin said in a brief interview to journalists on arrival at the airport. "I am convinced that our ties with Cuba will continue to strengthen and develop. They must be built on the basis of reciprocity. Cuba will become an equal partner of the USSR."

The head of the Soviet delegation declared that he views optimistically the prospects for the development of economic ties between Moscow and Havana.

Today Fidel Castro, first secretary of the Cuban Communist Party Central Committee, and chairman of the republic Councils of State and of Ministers, received L.I. Abalkin. During a short conversation which took place in a cordial and friendly atmosphere questions connected with the agenda of the intergovernmental commission session were discussed.

Cooperation Commission Meets

LD1304104990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 13 Apr 90

[Text] In Havana, the latest sitting of the intergovernmental Soviet-Cuban Commission on Economic and Scientific and Technological Cooperation has begun. The Soviet delegation is led by Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. The fulfilment of USSR and Cuban obligations regarding reciprocal deliveries of goods last year and prospects for cooperation are under discussion.

'Friendly' Consultations With Cuba Conclude

LD1704084190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0600 GMT 17 Apr 90

[Text] Soviet-Cuban consultations on a wide range of international problems and bilateral matters have ended in Havana. They were held during the working visit to Cuba by Viktor Komplektov, USSR deputy foreign minister. The discussions took place in a friendly and businesslike atmosphere and were marked by a high degree of mutual understanding.

Eastern Bloc-Latin American Cooperation Viewed

PY1304183890 Moscow in Spanish to Cuba 0030 GMT 13 Apr 90

[Leonid Levchenko commentary]

[Text] The revolutionary perestroyka in the Soviet Union marked the beginning of the process of transformation of obsolete structures that are now under way in countries of Eastern Europe. The peoples from these countries have voluntarily chosen the ways to achieve their development. They will in no way admit any form of foreign interference.

Latin American countries are also furthering their democratization process. Thus, their standing and role in world politics have improved. All Latin American countries have increasing aspirations of independence to overcome their economic shortcomings and to resolve their foreign debt problems. All these topics will be undoubtedly examined in Budapest, whether from this standpoint or from another.

Peruvian Vice Foreign Minister Jose Antonio Belaunde, whose country is currently chairing the Rio de Janeiro Group, believes that the Budapest meeting could become the first step toward establishing Latin American-Eastern Europe cooperation.

There are promising prospects in this direction. They could create joint enterprises and could attract the capital needed to meet the needs of their economic development. In any case, these forms of cooperation will enable the countries represented at the Budapest meeting to break the patterns of traditional trade.

It should be noted that the initiative to hold the meeting Latin America-Eastern Europe was made by the Rio de Janeiro Group. The Soviet Union has attached great significance to the efforts made by this group to strengthen peace and to intensify mutual understanding and cooperation among peoples.

Supreme Soviet Session

Supreme Soviet To Debate Gdlyan, Ivanov Case

LD1704075990 Moscow TASS in English 0743 GMT 17 Apr 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow April 17 TASS—The Soviet parliament met today to decide the fate of two criminal investigators who won fame for their high-profile anti-corruption drive in the early years of perestroyka but were later accused of using illegal investigative methods.

The Supreme Soviet heard a report by a special commission set up by the first Congress of Soviet People's Deputies to investigate into the activities of a group of investigators led by Telman Gdlyan and Nikolay Ivanov.

The second Congress of Soviet People's Deputies, held last December, ordered the parliament to discuss the commission's conclusions during its third session.

Gdlyan and Ivanov effectively busted a group of corrupt senior party and government officials in Uzbekistan several years ago, sending several republican leaders and some of the top brass at the Soviet Interior Ministry to the bench.

The investigators then mounted sensational accusations against four delegates to the 19th party conference and several officials in the Soviet prosecutor's office and party and government leaders.

In the past few months, Gdlyan and Ivanov were themselves accused of violating the criminal code and illegal arrests.

The two failed to show up at the parliamentary hearings, that they themselves have requested, Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov told the deputies.

The deliberations will be shown in full over Soviet TV, Lukyanov said.

'Moral Condemnation' Noted

LD1704101290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 17 Apr 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] As you know already, yesterday's session of the USSR Supreme Soviet saw heated debates around the bill on the taxation of enterprises, associations, and organizations. Opinions were sharply divided, and for that reason it was decided to carry the discussion over into the next sitting of the two houses. Today promises to be at least as heated.

[Correspondent V. Tsygankov—identified by caption] At the joint sitting of the two houses today, hearings began on the report of the commission set up by the first congress of the country's people's deputies to check the materials of the USSR Procuracy's investigative group headed by Gdlyan and Ivanov. For the first time, the Supreme Soviet is deciding the fate of two people's deputies, and this issue is being decided at open parliamentary hearings. True, neither Gdlyan nor Ivanov is in the hall, even though their main demand at many rallies has been that they should be given the opportunity to speak at just such a sitting.

An account of the work of the commission was delivered by Roy Aleksandrovich Medvedev, one of its co-chairmen. Eight lawyers, as well as writers, mathematicians, and workers, had worked on the commission. One of the commission's conclusions refers to the work of the USSR Procuracy and is extremely unflattering and unattractive. This applies particularly to the Directorate of Public Prosecutions.

The assembled company was informed of the conclusion reached by the Committee for Issues of Law and Order and the Struggle Against Crime by Yuriy Vladimirovich Golik, its chairman. He stressed that the committee is unable to provide a final, legal assessment of the actions of the two people's deputies. That could only be done during a judicial investigation.

From the moral point of view, the behavior of Gdlyan and Ivanov deserve moral condemnation. That is the view of the Commission for the Ethics of Deputies, as expressed by Anatoliy Alekseyevich Denisov, its chairman.

Following a speech by USSR Procurator General Sukharev, the debates began. More than 40 people put their names down to speak.

Commission Notes Power Abuse

LD1704100190 Moscow World Service in English 0900 GMT 17 Apr 90

[Text] The Supreme Soviet is conducting open parliamentary hearings on the issue of checking out materials connected with the work of the group of investigators headed by Telman Gdlyan and Nikolay Ivanov. The two men were absent from the morning session. Both are people's deputies and the check-up was conducted by a parliamentary commission.

The commission read its findings today at a joint sitting of the two houses of the Soviet parliament. Gdlyan, Ivanov, and the investigators led by them had explored cases involving bribery and embezzelment in Uzbekistan. They maintain that the corrupt leaders of the Central Asian republic had high-ranking protectors in Moscow.

The parliamentary commission failed to discover evidence that would testify to the guilt of high-placed officials such as Politburo member Yegor Ligachev. Some evidence on this score appeared to have been received under pressure exerted by investigators and those who gave it renounced it later.

The commission confirmed that Gdlyan and Ivanov had committed gross violations of the law when conducting investigations in Uzbekistan and stated that the Soviet Procurator's Office had been justified in dismissing them from leading the group of investigators.

The commission also concluded that there was a need to resolutely strengthen the staff and the leadership of the Procurator's Office.

The prosecutor general, Aleksandr Sukharev, requested the Supreme Soviet to consent to launch legal proceedings against Gdlyan and Ivanov. Addressing MPs he said that the efforts of Gdlyan and Ivanov aimed at exposing bribery had been useful but that the two men had grossly abused their power.

Speaking at the morning session one of the commission's cochairmen, Roy Medvedev, said that the widespread public response to the case of Gdlyan and Ivanov had been sparked by a public hatred of corruption and lawlessness.

Moscow TV Carries 16 Apr Soviet of Union Session

Taxation of Enterprises Debated

LD1604211290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1830 GMT on 16 April begins carrying a recording of the proceedings of the Soviet of the Union session 12 April at the Kremlin in Moscow in its program "At the USSR Supreme Soviet." The session is chaired by Ivan Dmitriyevich Laptev.

Laptev begins by announcing that there is a quorum and says that there are, in addition to deputies, 70 others taking part in this session of the Soviet of the Union. He says that the deputies are to discuss in the first reading the law on the taxation of enterprises drafted by the Planning and Budget Commission. He says that at the request of a group of deputies, an alternative draft bill has also been put forward for consideration. Laptev then invites Valentin Sergeyevich Pavlov to take the floor to deliver a report and asks for questions to be put in written form.

At 1835 GMT Pavlov begins his 28-minute report. He says that the draft bill to be considered is part and parcel of the economic reform being carried out in the country. He outlines the general content of the bill. Pavlov then says specific regional circumstances will have to be taken into account. He deals with certain specific features of the proposed legislation. He asks: What is the object of the taxation? The object of the taxation is taxable profit. He then talks about the rates of taxation; participation of enterprises in the formation of the budget must be equal, so that rates of taxation must be equal, too. Maximum taxation levels will have to be defined. The government agrees that this should be reduced to 55 percent from the originally planned figure of 60 percent. Even at 60 percent, the state budget would have received R6 billion less from industry than it does today.

Pavlov goes on to say that in the interests of strengthening the finances of enterprises, the government feels able to support this suggestion. Much will have to be done during the transitional period to a market-based economy, with additional taxes levied when prices are exceptionally high. Tax rates cannot be chosen arbitrarily, no matter how noble the cause. That would lead to more inflation. On the other hand, one cannot reduce tax levels to 30-35 percent; that again would lead to so-called empty money, money without goods upon which it could be spent. The budget cannot be cut below the proposed level without giving rise to disequilibrium. Payments into the budget during 1991 are expected to fall by R14 billion compared to present day figures. Enterprises will find themselves with additional funds following the conclusion of their other contributions to the central state budget. Tax concessions are provided for when funds are going to go into the social development of the enterprise. The aim is to act as an incentive for investment. Tax concessions will also apply to monies invested in environmental protection measures. Generally the tax concessions will lead to more money remaining in the hands of the enterprise.

Pavlov says: To distribute wealth properly, life shows that we have to have regulators and levers. Turnover tax will continue, but the draft proposes that this will be gradually turned into a value added tax or sales tax. Concessions will apply where an overseas partner is involved in an enterprise's activities. Pavlov then touches on the taxation of exports and imports and the taxation of the owners of means of transport. Norms will be introduced governing the observance of the taxation laws. About the alternative draft, Pavlov says that it is modelled too simplicistically on the U.S. system and will lead to too great a drop in state incomes from tax.

At 1903 GMT Pavlov thanks deputies for listening.

Laptev reminds the deputies that this is the first reading and hands the floor to Kucherenko.

At 1904 GMT Kucherenko of the Planning and Budget Commission says examination of the draft has been a long affair. Equal conditions have to be provided for all kinds of enterprises, while the state must be guaranteed an adequate income. Many suggestions were received by the commission, and all were carefully examined. Effects on various territories of the country have been considered. Foreign models have been examined. Kucherenko recommends adoption of the law. It will promote the right kind of economic reform. It will do away with redistribution of profit by the center and make enterprises masters of their own funds. It unifies the approach to taxation of enterprises and matches various other aims.

'Disputed Points' of Draft Noted

LD1604214190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1911 GMT on 16 April continues its recording of the proceedings of the Soviet of the Union session 16 April at the Kremlin in Moscow in its program "At the USSR Supreme Soviet."

Kucherenko goes on to concentrate on the disputed points of the draft. First, the tax rate of 55 percent: This increases amounts left at enterprises' disposal. A rate of 35 percent would reduce the state's income too much, thereby jeopardizing social programs; reductions in defense spending could not make up for this. Second, the law allows for adjustment to the tax rate in light of experience. The point at which profits are considered excessive has also been debated; the law makes profits above 40 percent subject to a 90 percent tax rate. Kucherenko says that some points need further refinement, but some have been settled, such as double taxation. About 40 percent of enterprises will be better off under the law, 20 percent will be about the same, and the other 40 percent may end up with less. The law will promote enterprise. Various concessions will have a beneficial effect for enterprises involved in social development. Charities are freed of tax. Progress to the new economic conditions means the new tax legislation is essential, as are changes in prices and other features. The first two years of operation of the new law will be the most difficult. Kucherenko says it was not possible to include all the amendments proposed by deputies, mentions some of the concessions which could not be included. Kucherenko requests that the draft be adopted on first reading.

At 1925 GMT Saunin of the Soviet of the Union Planning and Budget Commission, takes the floor. Naturally, everyone has some interest in this law, Saunin says. Is the 55 percent rate a lot or not? Effects of various rates have been examined. Authors of the alternative draft have taken models from other countries, for example the United States; but they have not taken into account the local and other taxes which also apply there. Foreign models cannot be adopted wholesale; local conditions must be considered, particularly the absence of economic stimuli of market conditions. The monopoly enjoyed by some enterprises bears some risk of promoting inflation, as does accumulation of funds which cannot be turned into goods. Saunin says that the tax system must be stable and flexible and the draft meets this requirement. Amendments can be made when market relations are in place.

At 1934 GMT Deputy Orlov approaches the rostrum. He says that he has to describe the four must unpopular laws in only 10 minutes: These concern tax on imports and exports; tax on funds for accumulation; the tax on turnover; and the tax on ownership of transport. Under perestroyka, taxation of joint enterprises certainly must be properly established. Orlov compares Soviet and foreign prices for oil and computers, which can lead to massive net profits. The law allows for taxation of profits arising from exchange rates. Orlov rejects suggestions that rates be set for individual categories of goods; far too much detailed work would be involved and currency rates fluctuate all the time. Orlov continues: The law on taxation of profits allows for taxation of funds for consumption. This does not happen abroad, because labor wages there are set by the market. Changes allowing enterprises to set their own wages have already led to wage rises above productivity. The law is aimed at keeping inflationary tendencies at bay. Orlov counters suggestions that the law will mean wages being taxed several times over. Only wages funds in excess of a certain level will be subject to tax. Orlov expresses hope that the Easter spirit will promote a good debate.

At 1949 GMT Deputy Zhuravlev quotes John the baptist on not setting tax rates too high. Regulatory principles have to be established which ensure moderation in taxation. The draft law has nothing to do with market relations; it is entirely in the mould of the command-administrative system. Today, there is only one market, the black market, says Zhuravlev. Price formation is the key to creating a legal market. The draft law ignores the laws of economics, treating taxation and price formation as separate entities. It only aims to ensure a certain income for the state. Profits made by reducing prices must not be taxed. Graduation of the tax needs examination.

At 1957 GMT Deputy Labunov talks about effects of the legislation on science and education, which could be a bad one. State support for science and education has been reduced, while income from industry has been affected by financial autonomy. The law taxes science and education establishments just like enterprises, but the apparent profit ratio of their products makes them liable to excess rates. Labunov proposes an amendment to make concessions for work promoting scientific progress.

Soviet of Nationalities Discusses Bill

LD1604224890

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2005 GMT on 16 April continues its recording of the proceedings of the Soviet of the Union session 16 April at the Kremlin in Moscow in its program "At the USSR Supreme Soviet."

Deputy Lushchikov speaks for the Committee on Legislation about aligning the taxation laws with other legislation and refers to various articles in the draft. The law should be worded more flexibly concerning concessions for charities, instead of listing currenlty favored ones. Concessions for owners of transport also need rewording.

At 2011 GMT Deputy Balenko says that the law proclaims equal treatment for all enterprises, but in fact has concessions for cooperatives, farming, small enterprises

at their start-up, and for enterprises of public organizations. There are over 4,000 youth enterprises in operation which provide services and consumer goods and contribute to social programs. These enterprises are treated very harshly by the draft law.

At 2017 GMT Deputy (?Yaroliyev) proposes an amendment to give concessions to the development of desert or semi-desert areas.

At 2021 GMT Deputy Yaroshenko asks that the draft offered by the Reforma group of deputies be distributed. Everybody wants to get the country out of economic crisis. Yaroshenko defends the idea of a 35 percent tax rate; the references to foreign systems have been misconstrued. He rejects attempts to use taxation to balance the budget; there are better ways. Yaroshenko continues: We talk of going over to market relations, but there are two approaches to this: raise prices and taxes, as seems to be the aim now; or release new, expensive goods on the market. The state owns vast amounts of goods, which could be released onto the market through denationalization and balance the budget. People are more likely to buy state assets than to lease them. Yaroshenko says that taxation on profit ratio of over 40 percent will not enocurage reduction of production costs. Various aspects of production costs should be given more consideration. Enterprises can use funds more effectively than the state, if the tax rate is lowered.

At 2033 GMT the recording of the 16 April session of the Soviet of the Union concludes. The announcer says: Also taking part in the discussion of the draft law were Deputies Leonchev, Miloserdnyy, Yemelyanov, Sulakshin, Sharin, Bunich, Stepanov, Kurtashin, Kirilov, and Golyakov. The announcer goes on to say that the debate will continue on Wednesday, 18 April.

At 2034 GMT Moscow Television Service in Russian begins carrying a recording of the proceedings of the Soviet of Nationalities session 16 April at the Kremlin in Moscow; this is part of the same program: "At the USSR Supreme Soviet." Rafik Nishanov is chairing this session of the Soviet of Nationalities.

The announcer says that the same people who delivered reports not further identified at the Soviet of the Union session also delivered reports at this session of the Soviet of Nationalities.

Nishanov calls the first speaker in the debate.

At 2035 GMT Deputy Vidiker expresses doubts about taxing profits of enterprises, which could mean less cpaital spending. The Law does not cater well for agricultural enterprises, especially in arid areas. Vidiker calls for concessions for organic produce. Veterans organizations should also have concessions.

At 2040 GMT Deputy Shamikhin says that he supports neither a 55 percent rate nor 33 percent. Tax rates should take technical retardation of enterprise into account. Concessions should be made for profits used for housing development. Shamikhin says: Tax is too high for leisure and holiday organizations.

At 2049 GMT Deputy Marinchev proposes extra concessions for production of affordable consumer goods and for spending profit on development of rural areas.

At 2059 GMT Deputy Yenokyan on lack of incentives to produce. Many light industry enterprises will be taxed around 90 percent, but the populace will not tolerate tax increases. Yenokyan proposes tax reduction and avoidance of double taxation on wage funds. He calls for adoption of Yaroshenko's version.

At 2105 GMT Labunov of the Committee on Public Education speaks on the perilous state of science and education. Scientific institutions should not be treated in the same say as ordinary enterprises. They are the brains of the nation. We must support science and education, Labunov says. They will help perestroyka.

At 2115 GMT Lisitskiy asks if we need such a law. Lisitskiy speaks of the voluminosity of the bill, specifically on tax on consumption funds. He supports Orlov, he says.

At 2122 GMT Deputy Palagnyuk says that taxation should not remove incentives. Palagnyuk proposes a uniform 40 Percent tax rate on profits regardless of profit ratio.

The recording concludes at 2126 GMT.

The announcer then says: Also taking part in discussion of the draft law were Deputies Sharipov, Komarov, Akayev, and Dubko. The debate will be continue don Wednesday, 18 april.

Parliament Chambers Consider Tax Bills

LD1604171990 Moscow TASS in English 1659 GMT 16 Apr 90

[By Tass parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow April 16 TASS—The two chambers of the Soviet parliament—the Council of the Union and the Council of Nationalities—held separate sessions today to consider alternative bills on tax to be levied from enterprises.

The first variant was presented by the government and Supreme Soviet commissions, the second is backed by its author, Viktor Yaroshenko, a Moscow economist.

With many approaches being identical—the single taxation order for all kinds of enterprises as against the current differentiated taxation rates, and the system of taxation privileges—the two projects differ on the size of the basic tax. The government insists on it being equal to 55 percent of profits (with 30 percent going to the state budget and 25 percent to the local one), the alternative project views 35 percent as the limit.

Critics of the government bill said it was geared to perpetuating the present administration system and is not consistent with the aim proclaimed by the government—to accelerate the transition to a market-oriented economy. According to Yaroshenko, the 55-percent tax is "confiscational in nature". Yaroshenko insisted on cutting state expenses and replenishing the budget at the expense of denationalized state property.

Arguing in favor of the government project, USSR Finance Minister Valentin Pavlov stressed that taxes below 55 percent would endanger the realisation of a number of major social programmes, estimated at above 60 billion rubles a year and already approved by the Supreme Soviet.

In addition, the minister said, a lower basic tax would result in increased money incomes without increasing supplies, and will thus boost inflation.

The discussion was adjourned until Wednesday.

Finance Minister Presents Law

LD1604121890 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Text] The two houses of the USSR Supreme Soviet, at their separate meetings, are discussing in the first reading the draft law on taxing enterprises.

When presenting the draft, Finance Minister Valentin Pavlov said the new approach to the tax policy stems from the sweeping changes in ownership in the Soviet Union. There will be equal conditions for the functioning of government and public enterprises, cooperatives, enterprises working on a lease contract, and others. And, for the first time, the labor staff will be protected against unlawful taxation.

The minister described the new law as anti-inflationary and said the government, which drafted it, does not seek to improve the financial standing of the country at the expense of the enterprises. All the taxes, the union, republican and local ones, will not exceed 55 percent. And that is considerably less than the now existing taxes. Besides, there will be a system of privileges. For instance, taxes will be reduced on funds channelled by the enterprises for social needs, charity, ecology, and development production.

Pavlov expressed firm belief that with the situation improving in the national economy taxes will go down. The present draft law is meant for the transition to a market economy and is viewed by parliament as a step in radicalizing the economic reform.

A representative of the Planning and Budget Commission said the new taxation system will make it possible to implement major social programs and that includes the pension reform which parliament will discuss this week.

Resolution on Economic Relations Law Published

LD1604132390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet has adopted a resolution on the procedure for bringing into force the USSR Law on the Bases for Economic Relations between the USSR and the Union and autonomous republics as of 1 January next year. The law in question is based on principles of federalism, economic independence, and the reciprocal accountability of the USSR and the union and autonomous republics. The law delimits the powers rather than restricts those of the USSR and the republics in the economic sphere, determines their financial and economic relations, establishes the legal basis for their participation in the all-union market, and provides legislative and contractual forms for regulating the relations of the USSR and the republics and guarantees the rights of the union and autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts and okrugs, local soviets of people's deputies, and the independence of enterprises. The document will be carried in the press tomorrow.

Roundup of Supreme Soviet Activities

LD1604131390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Excerpts] At the USSR Supreme Soviet session over to the All-Union Radio correspondents' post at the Kremlin. Aleksandr Ruvinskiy is on the line.

[Ruvinskiy] This week began with an examination of one of the fundamental laws of our economic reform. I am talking about the draft law on taxation of state, leasehold, cooperative, public, and other enterprises, associations, and organizations. This has been submitted in its first reading today for examination by the chambers. I remind listeners that the chambers are working separately today. The Soviet of the Union met this morning while literally at this moment, the sitting of the Soviet of Nationalities is getting under way here in the Kremlin. [passage omitted]

A central place in the draft law is occupied by taxation on the enterprise profits. The taxation rate is stipulated at 55 percent which is five points lower than that noted in the draft law on an integrated USSR taxation system. Our financial experts have calculated that as a result of a reduction in the proportion of taxation levied, payments to the state budget will be cut by R14 billion, calculating for this year, 1990. In this way, some enterprises are gaining substantial benefits here.

I have to say that even though work on this draft has been carried out at length and very meticulously and that it has been examined at all the committees and commissions, there was an immediate barrage of criticizm from the deputies at today's sitting of the Soviet of the Union. It came from those who represent our industry, agriculture, public organizations, and creative unions. A resolution from the 21st Komsomol Congress was even distributed here, in which the members of the

Komsomol similarly voice their disagreement with the draft. It says, in particular, that the fact must be born in mind that 90 percent of Komsomol enterprises began their activities without state investment, allocations for what they needed, resources, quotas or funds of any kind. Lately however, there has been no understanding within the USSR Government and its financial bodies of the significance and conditions of operation of young people's public organizations enterprises. There is no commitment to develop them. The adoption of the laws in the versions proposed will, in the estimation of the Komsomol bodies, leads to the curtailment of activities by more than 4,000 young people's public organizations enterprises, an end to financing a whole series of social programs and the loss of more than 200,000 jobs in young people's Komsomol enterprises. As a result, it robs young men and women of faith in the reality of perestroyka. That is what the resolution distributed today says. Many deputies, it has to be said, find these views contentious and give different arguments of their own.

The debate at today's sitting of the Soviet of the Union was, then, not completed. Many people wanted to speak and it was decided to continue the discussion at the next sitting. Literally, at this moment, the sitting of the Soviet of Nationalities has begun under the chairmanship of Deputy Nishanov. On its agenda is the same matter of taxation on state, lease-hold, cooperative and other enterprises, organizations, and associations.

Another piece of news I must report, which has become known to the people's deputies here, is that a guideline program for the work of the third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet has been worked out for 16-17 April. For tomorrow, it plans a joint session of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities. It will open at 1000 [0600 GMT] and on the agenda are the conclusions of the commission verifying the documents connected with the activities of the USSR Procuracy investigative group headed by Deputy Gdlyan. That will be examined tomorrow and of course we will endeavor to provide our First Program and Mayak listeners with the most detailed information possible as to how that sitting proceeds and the decisions taken at it. [passage omitted]

Committee Hearings on Ambassadorial Appointments

PM1604144990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
13 Apr 90 Second Edition p 1

[L. Dekabrev report: "Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary—For the First Time"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee held its first hearings on the question of the appointment of new Soviet ambassadors to a number of foreign countries 12 April.

This is a step which career diplomats and USSR Foreign Ministry staffers have long been waiting for, I was told in the corridors of the Kremlin by many of our country's newly appointed plenipotentiary representatives.

These unusual hearings took an unusual course. They were attended by deputies and representatives of the press. The word "diplomacy" is not veiled in romantic mystery but means hard work, accompanied by utmost exertion of intellectual and physical powers, for those who had assembled in the Malyy Hall of the Great Kremlin Palace. Most importantly—it means colossal responsibility to the Motherland and the people.

These people had come here to meet parliamentarians face to face, to pass a kind of "test" of glasnost within the walls of the Supreme Soviet, and to hear the deputies' instructions in respect of their new appointments.

Why make a secret of it, appointments to senior posts as plenipotentiary representatives of our state in the past were a kind of secret that was kept behind seven seals, and were decided behind closed doors somewhere deep inside the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In short, the notorious departmental approach reigned here, too. That is not the worst of it. Frequently people who were being "transferred" to other work were sent abroad as ambassadors, and sometimes this was used to "shunt around" people who had compromised themselves in the party or the economic sphere. If this happened, let us frankly admit it, our foreign policy was impaired in specific areas, and damage was done to an important cause in this way. This must change now.

According to A. Dzasokhov, the committee's chairman, deputies will henceforth be able to communicate directly with ambassadors working in "key countries and 'sensitive' geopolitical regions," so as to be able to form their own picture about their work, express their opinions, claims, and thoughts on specific foreign policy measures, and familiarize themselves with the general trend of the development of Soviet diplomacy.

The committee members approved the candidacies of the following USSR ambassadors:

A.A. Bessmertnykh, to the United States;
Yu.M. Vorontsov, to the USSR permanent mission at the United Nations;
I.P. Aboimov, to Hungary;
A.L. Adamishin, to Italy;
Yu.V. Dubinin, to France;
F.P. Bogdanov, to Romania;
Yu.B. Kashlev, to Poland;
B.D. Pankin, to Czechoslovakia;
V.P. Terekhov, to the FRG; and
G.S. Shikin, to the GDR.

Political & Social

Law on USSR, Republic Economic Relations Published

PM1604225790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
17 Apr 90 Morning Edition pp 1-2

[USSR law: "On the Fundamentals of Economic Relations Between the USSR and Union and Autonomous Republics"]

[Text] The present law defines the fundamentals of economic relations between the USSR and union and autonomous republics. It is based on the principles of federalism, economic autonomy, and mutual responsibility of the USSR and union and autonomous republics. The law delineates the powers of the USSR and the republics in the economic sphere, determines their financial and economic relations, establishes the legal foundations for their participation in the all-union market, and stipulates legislative and treaty-based forms for regulating relations between the USSR and the republics, along with guarantees for the rights of union and autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts and okrugs, and local soviets, and for the independence of enterprises.

Article 1. The USSR's powers in the economic sphere.

1. The USSR has jurisdiction over:

the establishment of the legislative foundations of the USSR's economic activity and the functioning of the all-union market;

the organization of the tax system in the USSR and the establishment of statewide taxes, imposts, and compulsory payments to the budget, and maximum rates [predelnyye razmery] of taxation;

the drawing up, ratification, and implementation of the union budget;

the elaboration of prospects for the country's socioeconomic development, and the drawing up and implementation of all-union programs;

the implementation of a general pricing policy and the organization of a financial and credit system and a unified money supply system;

the formation of all-union reserve, insurance, and other funds;

the establishment of common norms and regulations governing the protection of the environment and the use of natural resources;

the administration of rail, air, and sea transport, major pipelines, defense installations, space systems, the USSR Integrated Power System, all-union communications and information systems, and installations regarded as all-union state property in accordance with USSR legislation and agreements between the USSR and republics;

the coordination of republics' activities on questions of investment and depreciation policy; science and technology; employment and population movements; public education, health care, and culture;

the establishment in the USSR of minimum rates for pay, pensions, and other types of social welfare;

the definition of the foundations of all-union foreign economic policy and its implementation;

the establishment of the principles for the organization of customs operations based on the unity of the USSR's customs territory, customs duties, and customs charges; the definition of the boundaries of the USSR's economic zone and continental shelf and their protection;

the granting by the USSR of state loans and economic aid to foreign states, and the conclusion of agreements on state loans and credit obtained by the USSR from foreign sources;

the protection of the economic interests of the USSR, union and autonomous republics, enterprises, organizations, and Soviet citizens abroad;

the organization of all-union statistics and accounting services;

the organization of unified patent and meteorological services and a unified time, weights, and measures service, and the establishment of all-union standards.

2. The USSR carries out the legislative regulation of the spheres under its jurisdiction, forms all-union administrative organs—in whose work representatives of union and interested autonomous republics participate—and, if necessary, concludes agreements on economic matters with republics.

Article 2. The foundations of the economic autonomy of union and autonomous republics

1. Union and autonomous republics are empowered to resolve economic and social issues with the exception of those which are placed under USSR jurisdiction by the USSR Constitution, USSR legislation, and the present law.

2. On their territories, while observing USSR legislation, union and autonomous republics shall:

own, utilize, and dispose of land and other natural resources in their interests and the interests of the USSR;
adopt laws and other normative acts regulating the conditions of economic activity on republics' territories;
resolve questions of taxation and carry out budgetary activity;
regulate economic and social development on their territory and participate in the elaboration of statewide decisions on economic development and ways of implementing those decisions;
regulate investment activity and construction conditions on the republic's territory;
regulate prices on the basis of all-union pricing policy;
participate in the regulation of the money supply and lead the activity of republic banks;
implement foreign economic activity taking account of the obligations stipulated in the USSR's international treaties and agreements between the USSR and the republics; conduct border and coastal trade; register newly created joint ventures, international associations, and organizations, and provide incentives for enterprises

and organizations to engage in foreign economic activity; and shape and utilize the republic's foreign-exchange funds;

resolve questions of social development, employment, and regulation of the population's income, and safeguard the minimum rates of pay, pensions, and other types of social welfare laid down by USSR legislation;

establish ecological safety norms and implement nature conservancy activity on the republic's territory, define quotas and normatives for the use of nature, and issue permission for and bans on the activities of enterprises and organizations;

shape republic organs of state administration and determine their functions;

and resolve other questions of economic and social development which do not come under USSR jurisdiction.

Article 3. The foundations of financial and budgetary relations between the USSR and union and autonomous republics

1. The USSR budgetary system is made up of the union budget, independent republic (union and autonomous) budgets, and local budgets.

The procedure for compiling, examining, ratifying, and implementing the union budget is determined by the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the procedure for compiling, examining, ratifying, and implementing the republic budgets of union and autonomous republics is determined by legislation in those republics.

2. The USSR's jurisdiction covers the establishment of statewide taxes, imposts, and compulsory payments levied on all Soviet territory and used in whole or in part to shape the union budget. The schedule and size of these tax, impost, and payment rates are determined by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Union and autonomous republic organs of state power and administration resolve questions of the levying of statewide taxes and other statewide compulsory payments within limits set by USSR legislation.

3. Union and autonomous republics in accordance with USSR legislation set the republic taxes, imposts, and compulsory payments—including payments for natural resources—levied on their territories and payable to their budgets.

4. Union budget income is made up of statewide taxes, imposts, and compulsory payments (excluding the part payable to union and autonomous republics' republic budgets, autonomous oblast and okrug budgets, and local budgets) and income from the use of all-union property and measures carried out by union organs. The schedule of sources of income and the structure of union budget expenditure—including expenditure on subsidies for union and autonomous republics—are determined by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

5. Union organs together with union and autonomous republic organs set up regional development funds, reserve funds, innovation funds, nature conservancy funds, and other all-union funds to finance all-union and interrepublic scientific, technical, economic, social, nature conservancy, and other programs, as well as work to prevent and clear up after natural disasters, catastrophes, and accidents.

6. The USSR State Bank [Gosbank] regulates the money supply on the basis of a single currency unit—the ruble, issues money, sets the ruble exchange rate against foreign currencies, the regulations governing its exchange, and the procedure for buying and selling foreign-currency assets, and implements a unified credit policy in foreign economic relations.

Article 4. The all-union market

1. The formation and functioning of the all-union market is based on the independence of enterprises, associations, organizations, and individual commodity producers carrying out their economic activity in an environment of competition and equal rights for all forms of ownership, bearing in mind the antimonopoly and other legislation on the market.

Economic relations between enterprises, associations, organizations, and individual commodity producers on the one hand, and republic administrative organs and local organs of self-management on the other are based on a fiscal and contractual footing, unless stipulated to the contrary by legislation.

3. Commodity exchange on Soviet territory takes place under the conditions of the openness of republic markets and the absence of customs barriers—with the exception of markets organized in free enterprise zones, for which union and republic legislation lays down special economic and legal regulations [rezhimy].

In the sphere of commodity exchange between republics no discrimination is permitted against any republic, its juridical persons, or its citizens.

Union and autonomous republics are not entitled without mutual agreement with other union and autonomous republics to impose restrictions on the import and export of goods and financial resources, to prevent goods transiting their territories or property and monetary funds belonging to other republics' citizens and juridical persons being transferred beyond their borders, or to impose transit payments.

4. Within the limits of their competence union and autonomous republics are entitled to regulate the market for goods and services on their territory by means of the tax and pricing system, to provide incentives for production, and to lay down benefits funded out of the republic budget for sales of certain types of goods.

5. Within the limits of their competence union and autonomous republics lay down in law on their territory a single procedure for all investors to acquire property

and to carry out capital investment. Republic legislation guarantees investors a choice of contracting organizations as well as the repayment [vozvrashcheniye] of investments, and the repatriation [vyvoz] of income thereon.

6. Credit, accounting, and insurance services for subjects of economic management are implemented by institutions of the USSR Gosbank, independent commercial banks, insurance societies, and other credit institutions set up and operating in accordance with USSR and republic legislation.

7. Shares and other securities are issued and traded on the all-union market in accordance with union and republic legislation.

Article 5. Treaty-based forms of economic ties between the USSR and union and autonomous republics

1. Economic relations between the USSR and the republics—as well as between the republics themselves—which are not stipulated by corresponding legislation shall be regulated by bilateral and multilateral agreements. Questions of the exchange and transfer between republics of property belonging to them shall be resolved, joint ventures, organizations, institutions, and unified administrative organs created, and funds for the joint resolution of socioeconomic tasks set up on a treaty basis. Agreements may stipulate an exchange of the necessary planning, forecasting, commercial, scientific, technical, and other information.

Joint actions which infringe other republics' interests or lead to the undermining of the unity of the all-union market cannot be a subject of interrepublic agreements.

2. Union and autonomous republics are entitled to establish missions funded out of republic budgets in the capital of the USSR and the capitals of other republics.

USSR organs of state administration can set up their own services and subunits on republics' territories with their consent.

Article 6. Guarantees of the economic independence of union and autonomous republics

1. Union and autonomous republics participate in the resolution of economic and social issues coming under USSR jurisdiction at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the Federation Council, the USSR Government, and other USSR organs. Questions connected with observance of a union treaty shall be examined by the Federation Council with the participation of top state officials from the autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts, and okrugs.

2. Republics' supreme organs of state power can submit for examination by the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee questions on the correspondence to the USSR Constitution and USSR laws of acts regulating economic relations passed by USSR supreme organs of state power and administration.

3. Union and autonomous republics are entitled to appeal to the USSR president to suspend USSR Council of Ministers resolutions and orders which run counter to those republics' economic interests.

4. Union and autonomous republics' supreme organs of state power are entitled to protest to the USSR Council of Ministers acts passed by administrative organs subordinate to it which run counter to republics' economic interests. The USSR Council of Ministers shall examine this protest and make a final decision within one month.

Republics' governments may suspend the contentious acts on their territory during the period in which their protest is being examined.

5. Differences of opinion on economic issues between the USSR Government, union and autonomous republics, and between republics themselves as a result of the implementation of USSR laws or USSR Government resolutions and orders shall be examined by the USSR Supreme Soviet bearing in mind the recommendations of the Federation Council.

Article 7. Guarantees of the economic independence of autonomous oblasts and okrugs, organs of local self-management, and enterprises

1. The powers of autonomous oblasts and okrugs in the economic sphere are determined by USSR and union republic laws, which guarantee autonomous oblasts and okrugs the right to independent economic management.

2. Autonomous oblasts and okrugs, in accordance with USSR and union republic legislation, own, use, and dispose of land, other natural resources, and property owned by them on their territory.

3. Autonomous oblasts and okrugs ensure comprehensive socioeconomic development on their territories, independently form and implement their budgets, take measures to strengthen the financial base of organs of local self-management, set and regulate prices within the limits of their competence, participate in setting quotas and normatives for the use of nature on their territories, issue permission for and bans on the activity of subjects of economic management in accordance with union and republic legislation, engage in foreign economic activity, and resolve other matters falling within their purview.

4. The rights of local self-management organs are guaranteed by the USSR law "On the Basic Principles of Local Self-Management and Local Economic Activity [mestnoye khozyaystvo] in the USSR" and by other USSR, union, and autonomous republic legislative acts.

5. In accordance with USSR and republic legislative acts union and autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts and okrugs, and local soviets ensure the independence of and equal legal conditions for the activity of enterprises,

associations, and organizations located on their territories, irrespective of their types of organizational structure or forms of ownership.

Article 8. Responsibility of the USSR and union and autonomous republics for failure to fulfill their commitments

1. The USSR and union and autonomous republics are responsible for any failure to fulfill, or improper fulfillment of, commitments in the economic sphere laid down by agreements. These agreements shall stipulate sanctions for any failure to fulfill, or the improper fulfillment of, commitments.

2. Economic disputes stemming from economic agreements between union and republic administrative organs, or between union and autonomous republic administrative organs shall be examined, at the initiative of the interested party, by the USSR State Board of Arbitration.

3. In the event of USSR administrative organs carrying out decisions adopted in violation of existing legislation without coordinating their actions with the union or autonomous republic and thereby causing damage to that republic, such organs shall be obliged, on demand from the republic, to eradicate the negative consequences of these decisions and to pay compensation for any damage.

4. In the event of union or autonomous republic organs adopting decisions in violation of the rights and legally protected interests of other republics or the USSR, compensation for any losses shall be payable by the republic which adopted the decision.

5. All disputes on economic issues—including compensation for losses—between the USSR, union and autonomous republics, and autonomous oblasts and okrugs shall be put to arbitration or examined by the USSR Supreme Court.

Article 9. Regulation of special conditions relating to the economic independence of union and autonomous republics

1. At the republics' initiative the USSR may legislatively prescribe special economic conditions for them without infringing the legitimate interests of other republics or the USSR.

2. The powers of union and republic administrative organs in certain spheres of economic activity may be redistributed on the basis of mutual agreements between the USSR and union and autonomous republics.

M. Gorbachev, USSR president

Moscow, the Kremlin. 10 April 1990

Thousands Rally for 'Uzbek Mafia' Investigators

AU1704143690 Paris AFP in English 1415 GMT 17 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, April 17 (AFP)—Thousands of people, including Moscow City Council members, demonstrated near the Kremlin Tuesday in support of two judges facing sanctions over their probe into a corruption scandal that sent former Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev's son-in-law to jail.

Several thousand demonstrators carrying signs saying "Shame on Gorbachev, shame on the Central Committee" rallied as parliament was considering a request to lift the judges' parliamentary immunity.

Telan Gdlian and Alexander Ivanov stand accused of "abusing power" during their investigation of corruption in the republic of Uzbekistan.

Mr. Gdlian and Mr. Ivanov, both members of the Congress of People's Deputies, took over investigations into the so-called Uzbek Mafia in 1986. Two years later Mr. Brezhnev's son-in-law Yuri Churbanov was indicted for corruption.

However both were removed from the case after senior Soviet officials, including Yegor Ligachev, head of the Politburo's hardline conservatives, launched a campaign against them.

About 30 members of Moscow's newly-elected City Council joined the demonstration called by liberal movements in the Soviet capital.

Protesters demanded the resignation of prosecutor general Alexander Sukharev and "his clique at the prosecutor's office".

A parliamentary commission of enquiry recommended the judges lose their immunity in a report presented earlier in the day to the Supreme Soviet.

But the panel also said Mr. Sukharev should be dismissed, saying he was responsible for the conditions under which the judges carried out their investigation.

Further Reportage on 21st Komsomol Congress

Medvedev on 'Nervous' Debate

LD1604164290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Text] Our correspondent Yelena Katusheva reports on an important moment at the VLKSM [All-Union Komsomol] congress today:

[Katusheva] The delegates had to adopt a resolution on the open letter from the party Central Committee. Work on this resolution was undertaken at the Saturday evening plenary session of the congress. There was no unanimity. As a result, two commissions were formed—the so-called compromise commissions— which were to

submit for the delegates' judgment a compromise version today. And the discussion and adoption of this turned into a rather nervous debate. In the end, the adopted appeal of the 21st VLKSM Congress to the CPSU Central Committee and to communists of the country says, in part:

In our view, the open letter from the CPSU Central Committee is an attempt to weaken discussion in the party. We appeal to the CPSU Central Committee and to all communists and all party organizations to refrain until the 28th CPSU Congress from adopting organizational measures toward party members sharing a particular platform of the CPSU and ask supporters of the Democratic Platform to refrain from organizing into factions in the run-up to the congress. We believe that these steps may ensure constructive development of pre-congress debate.

At a plenary session of the congress which discussed the resolution of the congress on the open letter from the party Central Committee, a speech was made by Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev.

[Begin recording] [Katusheva] Vadim Andreyevich, how do you regard the way the debate has broken out at the congress on the adoption of a resolution on the party's open letter?

[Medvedev] I think there is something positive in this and especially positive in that those who are associated with the Komsomol feel concerned for all-party affairs, for the affairs of the country, for great political questions. This, on the whole, cannot fail to please one. Yes. But as to what was said in the course of the debate, I do not entirely agree with it, that the party pursues first one thing and then another, that it is clamp- down, that it is the end of democracy, virtually a conservative revolution. What do they mean? Where do they get that from." No, it is a step directed at development of debate, including the expression of other points of view, but it is a step that is needed and a precautionary step against those who want to destroy the party. That is something the Party Central Committee cannot view calmly. [end recording]

Background, Meaning of Party Letter Cited

LD1604222990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1950 GMT 16 Apr 90

["From the speech" by V.A. Medvedev, CPSU Central Committee secretary, to the 21st All-Union Komsomol Congress on 16 April; from the "All-Union Komsomol Congress Diary" program—recorded]

[Text] [Medvedev] We should know and grasp the lines of the party Central Commitee's letter very carefully, even scrupulously, because no sooner had it appeared than interpreters of that letter appeared, saying things to the effect that it was an attempt to shut someone's mouth, that first the party invited discussion but now they were trying to put an end to it by administrative-command methods; that the letter was a signal to open a struggle against dissidence, to restrict socialist pluralism of opinions; that it was an attempt to purge, an attempt to tear away from the party some of those in it who hold different views. I must say that these interpretations of the letter are, to my mind—I know it verbatim, I worked on it at all its stages—in keeping neither with the spirit nor the letter of that letter, although people say that the letter is one thing but its interpretation in the localities is another. Fears are being expressed that there could be some additional instructions which would give some conservative and other forces in the party the possibility of dealing with their ideological opponents. In this connection I would like to read the text of a very short decision by the CPSU Central Committee which, as it were, accompanies the open letter by the CPSU Central Committee. I believe that the position of the party Central Committee on this issue will become clearer from it.

First, the text of the letter by the CPSU Central Committee to the country's Communists in favor of consolidation on a basis of principle should be approved and published in the press. Second, party committees should determine expedient forms for the letter to be discussed by communists. All efforts should be made to activate discussion of the party's precongress documents so that it passes off in a genuinely democratic, comradely, and creative atmosphere, and contributes to the consolidation of healthy forces in the party, and to successful preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress; that it should distance itself from socialist, anti-party ideological positions, without restricting the freedom of discussion, but while strengthening its constructive principles; that organizational measures should be adopted in necessary cases against leaders of factional and splittist currents, going as far as excluding them from the CPSU; and that an attentive approach should be taken toward Communists who have been led astray and have been unable to discover the true aims of the organizers of factional struggle or to correctly evaulate the perestroyka taking place in the party. It is a matter of putting an end to the factional struggle within the party, of opening a path for the party's consolidation. We are in favor of consolidation; we are opposed to a split that is in fact already the cause, as it were, of the practical activity of certain of our currrents, including the Democratic Platform.

[Unidentifed delegate] Has the CPSU Central Committee Politburo foreseen what consequences the publication of this letter will have in the localities, since there are many cases in our history where good intentions have been interpreted quite differently in the localities and have taken on a quite different hue?

[Medvedev] Thank you. I have spoken about this, and such fears have indeed been expressed and taken into account, so that no opportunity is provided to any forces to use the letter in order to extract some advantage from it for themselves, or to adopt organizational measures against any party members from ideological motives.

These guarantees have been provided in the letter, including in the decision I have read to you. Furthermore, I must say to you that this is our common concern, and we shall have to look carefully at how things are going in the localities.

CPSU Stance on Members Criticized

LD1604183190 Moscow TASS in English 1807 GMT 16 Apr 90

[By TASS special correspondents]

[Text] Moscow April 16 TASS—Delegates to the 21st Congress of the Young Communist League (YCL) of the Soviet Union, which continues its work in Moscow, today issued an address to the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU) Central Committee and all communists, suggesting that the CPSU refrain from organisational measures, until the CPSU's 28th Congress, with regard to party members that adhere to platforms that differ from that of the CPSU Central Committee.

Through this document representatives of young people expressed their attitude to the CPSU Central Committee's April 11 open letter "For Consolidation on a Principles Basis," which insists on the expulsion of those who aim to split the party and to organisationally shape factions inside the CPSU.

The CPSU Central Committee's letter was ardently discussed during the YCL Congress, and many delegates viewed it as a "serious political miscalculation" which may lead to the use of administrative pressure methods to combat dissent within the party.

"We are convinced that only the CPSU Congress may determine the strategic line of the party, relying on everything progressive that is reflected in the platform of the CPSU Central Committee, the 'Democratic' or some other platforms," the YCL address says.

"Only the CPSU Congress has the right to decide whether there is room in the party for advocates of this or that theoretical point of view."

Vadim Medveyev, Politburo member and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, explained the Party Central Committee's open letter during the discussion at the YCL forum.

He read out the text of the CPSU Central Committee's resolution which had been adopted simultaneously with the letter. The Central Committee recommended party organisations, "without limiting the freedom of discussion, and enhancing its constructive principles," to dissociate themselves from "anti-party ideological positions and if necessary take organisational measures with regard to leaders of factional separatist currents, right up to their expulsion from the CPSU."

So, the question is not to take any measures with regard to people for their ideological positions, Medvedev emphasised. Both the letter and the accompanying resolution explicitly cautioned against pushing away those who adhere to different views. Organisational measures should be taken only with regard to organisers of factions, those who seek to split the party, Medvedev explained.

The YCL Congress, however, did not support such a point of view. In the "address to the CPSU Central Committee and the communists of the country," adopted at the YCL Congress today, the CPSU Central Committee letter is described as an "attempt to weaken discussion within the party."

At the same time the delegates suggested that the supporters of the "Democratic Platform" abandon work to form factions in the run- up to the CPSU's 28th congress.

Leniency on Alternative Views Urged

LD1604141490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1317 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, 16 Apr (TASS)—TASS special correspondents report:

The delegates of the 21st Komsomol Congress which is continuing work in Moscow today made an appeal to the CPSU Central Committee and to all communists, in which they proposed that no organizational measures with regard to those party members who adhere to a different platform to that of the CPSU be taken before the 28th CPSU Congress.

This document expresses the attitude of the young people's representatives toward the open letter of the CPSU Central Committee published on 11 April "for consolidation on the basis of principle," which insists on expelling from party ranks those "who are persistently and purposefully moving toward a schism and are creating established fractions within the CPSU."

There was a heated discussion of the letter from the CPSU Central Committee during the Komsomol congress and the assessment of many delegates was that it is a "grave political error" which can lead to the use of administrative and forceful methods of combatting "alternative views" [inakomysliye] in the party. "We are convinced," says the Komsomol appeal, "that only a CPSU Congress can determine the party's strategic line, backed in doing so by all that is progressive in the CPSU platform, the democratic platform or any other platform." Only a congress has the right to decide whether there is a place in the party for the proponents of a specific theoretical point of view."

During the discussion at the young people's forum, Vadim Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, provided explanations of the open letter from the CPSU Central Committee. He read the text of a CPSU Central Committee resolution which was adopted at the same time as the letter. The Central Committee recommends that party organizations, while "placing no limitations on the

freedom of debate and strengthening its constructive principle," distance themselves from "anti-party ideological positions and in cases where it is necessary, take organizational measures regarding the leaders of fractional and schismatic tendencies up to and including their expulsion from the CPSU."

It is, therefore, Medvedev stressed, not a matter of taking measures of some kind against people because of their ideological stance. Both the letter and the resolution that goes with it contain a clear and unambiguous warning not to cast out those who hold other views. Organizational measures should only be applied to the organizers of fractional groups and those who are attempting to split the party, explained the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The Komsomol congress, however, did not uphold this point of view. In the "Appeal to the CPSU Central Committee and the Communists of the Country" adopted at the congress today, the Central Committee's letter is described as "an attempt to weaken discussion inside the party." At the same time, the delegates spoke in favor of the supporters of the "Democratic Platform" refraining from forming fractions in the run-up to the congress.

Politburo Members Attend Congress

LD1604192190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Excerpts] Today's morning sitting of the 21st Komsomol Congress concluded the debate that has been continuing for nearly three days over the adoption of an appeal by the congress to the CPSU Central Committee and the country's communists. [passage omitted]

At the evening session the delegates set about discussing the Komsomol draft rules. Taking part in the congress work have been comrades Ligachev, Medvedev, Razumovskiy, Manayenkov, Frolov, Usmanov, and Girenko. The Komsomol Congress will continue its work on 17 April.

PRAVDA's Frolov Meets Delegates

LD1504202190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 15 Apr 90

[Text] A meeting took place today at the PRAVDA editorial office between Ivan Timofeyevich Frolov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the paper's editor-in-chief, members of the editorial board, and delegates to the 21st congress of the VLKSM [All-Union Komsomol] Our correspondents reports:

[Correspondent] More than 70 percent of delegates to the Komsomol congress are communists. Naturally, they are not indifferent to the prospects of the party and its central body. Animation, I would even say impatience, prevailed in the hall today. There was a multitude of questions: the paper's role and place in a multi-party society; whether the editor-in-chief should be elected or appointed; whether the collective felt administrative pressure. Ivan Timofeyevich Frolov noted that a breaking of stereotypes which have formed was not taking place in the editorial office. I think that there are already certain changes for the better; it is enough only to open today's issue. There was stormy and frank discussion about the most important issues of politics and youth and on problems concerning relations between the party and the Komsomol.

We complain that our Komsomol has been passive. Yesterday's situation attests rather that it is beginning to become more active. I am thinking of the resolution which the congress adopted by a majority of votes on an open letter to the Central Committee. What's your assessment of this situation?

[Frolov] Well, I think that this is not yet final, this decision. It seems that certain other disputes lie ahead tomorrow. But I think they will produce results. There is the possibility now of thinking for a while. Everything was adopted very hurriedly, somehow, yesterday. I believe that the proceedings of the congress are very interesting, creative. But young people are young people—there is much discussion and many varied approaches and a great wish somehow to reveal one's own views.

I think the main thing, and what is now becoming obvious to everyone here, is that young people must be more active everywhere and go out to the most decisive frontiers, both in science, in creativity, in art, literature and, of course, in politics.

Opening of Congress Reported

PM1604144190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Apr 90 Second Edition p 1, 2

[O. Matyatin, A. Murtazayev, and V. Ryashin report: "Search for New Role. At the 21st Komsomol Congress"]

[Excerpts] Former Komsomol [All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League] congresses are indelibly imprinted on our memory. Therefore, the first session of the current congress yesterday felt somehow strange. No formalistic excesses on the podium. No thundering applause. The cheerleaders were silent. Maybe they no longer exist? On the other hand, the group for handling delegates' proposals and critical remarks in the secretariat was ready to get down to work, equipped with a good data system and clerical facilities.

As is customary under pluralism, the opening of the congress got immediately bogged down in the discussion of procedural questions. Lines formed at the 12 microphones in the hall which were working flat out. Standing orders, agenda, order of questions. A vote. Another vote. Arguments with the chairman. Arguments among the delegates. Critical remarks to the presidium. In short, just like in real life. [passage omitted]

The Komsomol Central Committee also departed from a tradition which until recently was considered unshakable: It published its report in advance, inviting the country's Komsomol members to discuss it. Its tenor differs sharply from former documents of this kind. There is no hint of the former bravura by which expert Komsomol stylists created the effect of a triumphal account.

The drammatic notes which resound now are of a different kind. "The 21st Komsomol Congress is an extraordinary congress despite the fact that this term was not used in the decision to convene the congress,"—this is how the report begins. "What makes it extraordinary is the entire development of the Komsomol over the three years which have elapsed since the 20th congress, the further exacerbation of the political situation in society, and the mounting economic instability and social tension."

It is true that young people are no longer satisfied with the myths according to which the Komsomol was a flourishing youth union and the young men and women whom it united were marching along a straight path into a happy future.

Today, in reaction to the state of total sweetness and light proclaimed in the past, a rather exaggeratedly critical approach to the assessment of the situation prevails, reminiscent of certain symptoms of panic-mongering: Everything is bad, everything is in a state of collapse. It is claimed that Komsomol is in an impasse, and there is talk about a crisis fraught with the disintegration of the unionwide organization. [passage omitted]

It is obvious that the Komsomol today must engage in an active search for a new role which will enable it to turn into an organization that truly represents the interests of the young generation and provides it with an opportunity for self-realization in the political and economic spheres and in spiritual life. It is this which will enable the Komsomol to retain its position as the vanguard of the youth movement.

To what extent is the Komsomol prepared to seize its chance?

"The Order of the Day is Action"—this is the title of one of the chapters of the Komsomol Central Committee report which contains a full-blooded program for the renewal of the Youth Union.

Everything depends on the extent to which it will be filled with a practical content. So what are the Komsomol's assets at present?

Delegates are invited to ponder a number of facts which demonstrate that Komsomol organizations are capable of resolving independently, without waiting for help from outside, many of the problems that have built up. [passage omitted]

During the evening session V.I. Mironenko, first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee, finally began delivering the Komsomol Central Committee accountability report.

The Komsomol's political stance is based on the socialist idea but it is not defined by dogma, he noted. It is dictated—just like the need to participate in the solution of absolutely all the questions pertaining to life—by the main concern, the concern for young people's rights and their opportunity to achieve self-development and self-realization.

The congress is attended by M.S. Gorbachev, L.N. Zaykov, V.A. Kryuchkov, Ye.K. Ligachev, N.I. Ryzhkov, A.N. Yakovlev, A.V. Vlasov, A.I. Lukyanov, Ye.M. Primakov, B.K. Pugo, G.P. Razumovskiy, D.T. Yazov, A.N. Girenko, Yu.A. Manayenkov, Ye.S. Stroyev, G.I. Usmanov, and I.T. Frolov.
The congress is expected to last until 17 April.

Shevardnadze Signs Agreement With Science Academy

LD1604135490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1252 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, 16 April, (TASS)—USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Eduard Shevardnadze and Guriy Marchuk, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, signed an agreement today on coordinating efforts and interaction between the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the USSR Academy of Sciences in the sphere of international relations.

The aim of this document is to create a legal and financial base for further improving cooperation between the diplomatic service and academic science, in the interests of strengthening the scientific foundations of Soviet foreign policy. The signed agreement expresses the intention to coordinate a program of fundamental research on international topics, make wider use of special-purpose study of individual foreign policy problems on an economic contract basis, and to coordinate efforts in the sphere of international scientific and practical links.

Yanayev Elected To Head Trade Union Council

LD1704122590 Moscow TASS in English 1205 GMT 17 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 17 TASS—A meeting of the Soviet trade union council elected Gennadiy Yanayev, 52, the new Soviet trade union boss, replacing retiring Chairman Stepan Shalayev.

Yanayev was born in Gorkiy region and began working on a farm in early childhood to help a region that lost most of its male population in the war.

After graduating from an agricultural institute, Yanayev was put in charge of a tractor repair station and then a regional repairs service.

Yanayev's life took a sharp turn after he graduated from a law school, plunging into politics.

For 12 years, Yanayev headed the Soviet Committee of Youth Organisations, and then worked as a deputy chairman of the Soviet Friendship Societies Union.

Beginning from 1986, he held senior posts in the Soviet trade union movement—secretary and then deputy chairman of the Soviet Central Council of Trade Unions.

Yanayev has been a member of the Soviet Communist Party for about 30 years. He is a member of the International Labour Organisation Administrative Council.

Yanayev is a popular figure in the international workers' and trade union movement. He has won domestic popularity for his parliament crusade for workers' social and economic rights and interests.

[Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1300 GMT on 17 April, reporting on the AUCCTU meeting, adds that Comrades Razumovsiy and Baklanov participated in the meeting]

Yeltsin on Democratic Supporters Leaving CPSU

LD1604173190 Moscow World Service in Russian 0930 GMT 14 Apr 90

[From the "Soviet Chronicle" feature of the "Soviet Union Day by Day" program; report attributed to INTERFAX]

[Text] Speaking at a meeting of a working group of the association of Democratic Platform communists, Boris Yeltsin has unequivocally expressed his opposition to its supporters leaving the party in haste and setting up a new party prior to the 28th CPSU Congress.

Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic People's Deputy Valeriy Lunin, who is a member of the Democratic Platform Coordinating Council, and who represents the Conference of Secretaries of Moscow Primary Party Organizations' association of communists, notified the Democratic Platform working group that in the event of its approving the withdrawal of its supporters from the CPSU prior to the 28th party congress, he would leave the coordinating council.

Presidential Council's Shatalin on Market Economy

LD1604141990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1301 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, 16 Apr (TASS correspondent)—Stanislav Shatalin, member of the USSR Presidential Council, described the transfer of the Soviet economy to a regulated, socially-protected market "a question of political choice." This question, the prominent Soviet economist said in an interview with TASS parliamentary correspondent Andrey Orlov, "has already been resolved in the affirmative, once and for all. The problem lies only in choosing the most effective measures capable of limiting to the minimum the negative consequences of such a transition."

Speaking about the forms and time frames of the reform, Academician Shatalin, who took part in the reform debate at the recent joint sitting of the Paresidential Council and Council of the Federation, cautioned against "carrying out neurosurgical operations with an axe." The transition to the market "should take account of the state of unreadiness of the population—and not only of the population," he stressed. "Unles we do that, we will simply be swept aside. After decades of lethargic slumber, society is terribly politicized. If we want to build a healthy economy, and not a communal grave, we must act in a well-considered way and with caution."

The scholar regards as a major condition for transition to the market, guarantees that under the conditions of the market, "the low- and average-paid strata of the population will not suffer."

"The reform can be implemented only on the basis of national agreement and confidence in the government," the Presidential Council member said. In order to attain this, "the government must prove to the population in deeds that it is in command of the situation, knows what it is doing, and is aware of the consequences of the steps undertaken."

The market is an excellent mechanism, but it does not solve all problems, the scholar said. The state will therefore continue to intervene in the economy in the future. Fundamental science, health, education, and many other areas will remain in its hands.

It is planned to continue discussion on the measures for an accelerated transition to a regulated market at a joint sitting of the Presidential Council and the Council of the Federation this week.

Baklanov Attends Cosmonautics Day Meeting

PM1604151190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Apr 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Celebrating the Holiday"]

[Text] The achievements and problems of Soviet cosmonautics were discussed at a ceremonial meeting devoted to Cosmonautics Day. It took place in Moscow, in the House of the Unions Hall of Columns, 12 April. Scientists, designers, Soviet cosmodrome workers, Mission Control Center and Cosmonaut Training Center experts, pilot-cosmonauts of the USSR, and representatives of the public gathered on the occasion of the holiday.

The space industry, which represents an amalgam of leading achievements of science and technology, ensures the solution of key tasks concerning defense and various sectors of the country's economic and social development, V. Radovskiy, director general of the "Energomash" Science and Production Association, said in his report.

The meeting was attended by O.D. Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and I.S. Belousov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

Vorontsov Questioned on Environmental Pollution

LD1604221590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1500 GMT on 16 April broadcasts a 60-minute program entitled "Face the Country," featuring Nikolay Nikolayevich Vorontsov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for the Protection of Nature, facing questions from program presenter Vladimir Nazarov, from the studio audience, from a group of people assembled with placards outside the Moscow City Soviet building linked to the studio by a television hook-up, and from listeners invited to phone in.

Vorontsov begins the program by indicating ecological black spots on a map of the USSR which correspond to heavily industrialized areas and cities. He advocates defining ecological catastrophes in legal terms. From among the most seriously affected areas he cites the Barents Sea, which is over-fished to the extreme; a large part of Belorussia contaminated by the Chernobyl accident; the area northwest of the Caspian Sea—in and around the Kalmyk Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic—suffering due to over-intensive agriculture; the Aral Sea, where the financial losses incurred are comparable to those of Chernobyl.

This is followed by a question-and-answer session with the studio audience. During a break in the session, the following information is shown on the screen:

"Data of the USSR State Committee for Statistics.

Forty million people in the country live in regions with a catastrophic level of atmospheric pollution.
"Fifteen percent of towns and 47 percent of villages have no sewage system.
"Fifteen percent of villages do not have piped water.
"Seventy percent of effluent water in the USSR is released in an unpurified form.
"The concentration of harmful substances in the Volga is nine times greater than the permitted norm, and 10 times greater than the norm in the Dnestr, the Western Bug, the Danube, and the rivers of Sakhalin, Kamchatka, and the Kola Peninsula."

A listener telephones from Zhitomir Oblast, asking whether Vorntsov could get the Supreme Soviet to have radiation meters suplied free to the inhabitants of areas affected by the Chernobyl accident. Vorontsov says that a meter is being developed which might cost around R30 instead of R250, the current price.

Asked whether he favors a moratorium on the construction of new nuclear power facilities, Vorontsov replies that if constructed properly, as in the West, nuclear power stations can help the environment. He fears, however, that even a well-designed station would operate poorly because of slipshod Soviet construction.

Another break follows, in which polluted areas of the USSR are discussed. Industrial effluents are causing substantial damage in the far east according to one video report. Another report, from Moldavia, shows the mother-and-child health care center of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic, where correspondent Ivan Petko quotes the chief doctor as saying that all the children there have been subjected to pesticides and herbicides. Virtually all of the republic's inhabitants have some kind of alergy and there is an increasing rate of congenital deformity. Moldavia sadly is top in the USSR in this latter respect, says the correspondent. The camera shows children with skin diseases.

In conclusion, Vorontsov answers a series of questions from the studio audience and the presenter about his personality and working life.

Ligachev, Others Address Veterans' Plenum

90UN1314A Moscow VETERAN in Russian No 13, 26 Mar-1 Apr 90 pp 2-3

[V. Onufriyev, A. Pozdnyakov report: "For the Socialist Renewal of Society"]

[Text] As we have already reported, a plenum of the All-Union Council of War, Labor, and Armed Forces Veterans was held on 16 March in Moscow, in the Soviet Army Central House imeni M.V. Frunze.

On the agenda was discussion of the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th party congress "Toward Humane, Democratic Socialism."

Marshal of the Soviet Union N.V. Ogarkov, chairman of the All-Union Council of War, Labor, and Armed Forces Veterans, called on Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to deliver the report.

At the present time, Ye.K. Ligachev observed, the nature and rhythm of our social and political life are determined by preparations for the 28th party congress and implementation of the second stage of the political reform. Briefly put, the preparations for the congress signify primarily an analysis of how the policy of perestroyka is being implemented and of how the economic and political difficulties which have arisen in society are being overcome. Understandably, they include also the elaboration of program documents.

The Central Committee February Plenum adopted the draft platform of the CPSU Central Committee for the 28th party congress—an important document determining the action program for the coming period. Three meetings of the Central Committee March Plenum were held. Both the February and the March plenums were conducted in an atmosphere of high activity, self-criticism and an impassioned confrontation of various viewpoints on many fundamental questions of our

policy. The CPSU Central Committee Politburo, our party leadership and specific politicians came in for serious criticism. The main thing now is not so much an acknowledgment of past mistakes as active, vigorous, and consistent work to rectify them.

The Central Committee's draft platform for the 28th congress on the one hand reflects the changes which are occurring in our society and, on the other, determines precise political reference points for the coming period of its development. It provides answers to the questions of where we are heading, what we are renouncing and what we will take with us as we accomplish fundamental social transformations. It points out that we are proceeding along a path of building humane, democratic socialism. Genuine socialism is characterized by developed democracy, the power of the working people, social justice, socialist morality, internationalism and peace.

I am of the view that we have a socialist system. Many millions of people at the most difficult periods of our history have been involved in the building of socialism. But big deformations, unthinkable lawlessness, punitive measures, and violations of the fundamental principles of scientific socialism were perpetrated. We are building a society in which the economic basis is public property in the form of state and cooperative enterprises integrated with private labor property. We are building a society in which the political bases are the soviets of people's deputies and socialist democratism. The building of scientific socialism means the affirmation of socialist values and those common to all mankind.

The draft platform states that it completely rejects authoritarian-bureaucratic methods of leadership and emphatically renounces the distortions of socialism and tyranny born of Stalinism. But the most important thing is that we are now involved in the creation of safeguards against anything of the sort occurring in the life of our people; that is, the creation of a system in which there really is the power of the working people and the supremacy of socialist legality.

The draft platform emphasizes the shining facets which we should treasure—the role of internationalism, love for the Soviet motherland and the great and valuable things in our history which we must not forget. I believe that if from the very start of perestroyka we had armed ourselves with the people's patriotism and our illustrious history—granted all its tragic character, granted all its complexity—we would be overcoming the difficulties and crisis phenomena which have arisen considerably more easily. We can take pride in the fact that over the centuries the peoples of Russia created and shaped a single Russian state. We have a right to be proud of the fact that the people, headed by the Party of Lenin, accomplished the Great October Socialist Revolution and thereby in fact determined the further development of human civilization. We have every right to be proud of the fact that it was our people and our army—and this is recognized even by our enemies—which broke the back of the fascist army and were ultimately able to save mankind from the brown plague. The fact that the country of soviets became a great power was the achievement of its own labor, without any people being exploited. We have exploited no one, have extracted profit from no one. All this constitutes our national pride. We sometimes forget, incidentally, our country's greatness—we are reminded from abroad.

The draft platform confirms that at the center of party policy is Soviet man. It stresses the need for social justice and the utmost development of each individual both from the viewpoint of spirituality and material well-being. The paths of the achievement of this goal are sign posted: large-scale measures pertaining to the creation of a planned-market economy, stabilization of the consumer market, an increase in the production of consumer goods, price reform, the development of socialist democracy and self-management and renewal of the Soviet federation.

It is very important, and we need to call attention to this, that in the draft platform the party proclaims movement toward an irreversible peaceful period of mankind's development.

Particularly keen discussion is currently underway in society concerning so-called private property. Originally the draft platform also allowed for private property. But in the course of debate at the plenum this proposition was excluded. I am emphatically opposed to the introduction of private property in the form of appropriation of the results of another's wage labor. After all, what is meant by type of property? It means type of system, way of life, social and political system. Whoever advocates private property and allows it is moving toward a fundamental change in the course of our country's social development, toward the profound social stratification of society.

In the process of extensive democratization and the decentralization of administration, Ye.K. Ligachev continued, a strengthening of central authority is needed more than ever. Proceeding from current tasks and the long term, the Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies adopted a system of presidential governance. But at the same time, if we stand on the soil of realism, we should not harbor illusions that everything will now of its own accord lead the country out of the acute crisis situation in economic, social, and political life. The introduction of a system of presidential governance, as a most important means of strengthening state leadership, should be supplemented by the restoration and strengthening of our party's vanguard role.

Among the many factors by which our country found itself in a critical situation I would distinguish as decisive the weakening of the party both organizationally and ideologically. I believe that it is the party together with the soviets of people's deputies which is capable of extricating the country from the difficult situation and leading it onto the road of progress.

The departure of certain components of the party from matters connected with the economy seems wrong to me. The economy is the decisive sphere of human activity. The party has gone into these matters carefully. But who should deal with them now? The soviets. But we have not yet prepared them for taking over the economy. For this reason the party should, in my view, go carefully into this business also, without, of course, interfering in operational management matters. There must be no return to command methods. But the party should still perform consistent and persevering organizational, political, and economic work at all levels of our economic organism and in all spheres of material production—by different paths and methods.

The task of a renewal of the party on the basis of wide-ranging democratism and intraparty democracy confronts us squarely. This is a most important, key program proposition of the draft platform. We need to do everything to ensure that the communists themselves decide all questions of the life of the party. Now, when factions and groups, which we did not have previously, have emerged therein, we must invest in the concept of party renewal demarcation and a purge thereof of opposition and factional groups. Unless we do so, this will no longer be the party to which we have sworn fealty. It will be a different organization.

It is necessary under current conditions to enhance to the utmost the role and responsibility of the communists and all our primary party organizations for party affairs.

The bulk of communists, Ye.K. Ligachev continued, have accepted the party's draft platform for the 28th congress inasmuch as this document has succeeded in taking account quite fully of the communists' opinions, proposals, and expectations.

A very important question, on which attention is now riveted, is that of democratic centralism. The draft rules, which we discussed at the plenum, excluded this term itself, although the entire essence of this principle is preserved. Speaking on this question, Central Committee members are now correcting us. I consider this right. We need to put the emphasis on democratic principles, on the possibility of communists expressing their opinions and debating. But if a decision has been adopted by a majority, all, the minority included, are obliged to comply with it.

There is much discussion as to the principle in accordance with which to build the party organizations. Opinions to the effect that we should adopt only the territorial principle are being voiced. Some people are even saying that the party organizations should quit the shop floor. There are many voices to the effect that the party organizations should leave the army and KGB, the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the procuracy subdivisions. The draft new rules state precisely and clearly that the party is built according to the territorial and production principle in all state, production, and other organizations. This is of fundamental significance.

Disquiet surfaces also in connection with the fact that the working class and peasantry are narrowly represented with us in the state and party authorities. This is a serious problem. It is growing and intensifying. Much is said about the decisive role of the working class and the significance of the alliance of the working class, peasantry, and intelligentsia, but the workers and peasants are very inadequately represented in the soviets and party authorities. Thought should be given, perhaps, to the establishment of a quota for workers and peasants.

The draft platform testifies that the party is capable of perceiving the new realities, drawing conclusions, and perfecting and restructuring itself together with the changed conditions and also with regard for the new tasks being tackled in the course of perestroyka. Now, when other political parties are emerging, we need to very considerably intensify our work and exert influence both by force of the communists' example and mass organizing and ideological and educational activity. We must earn political authority.

I believe you will agree, comrades, that the CPSU is approaching the 28th congress with a platform of scientific socialism, democracy, and creation.

Ye.K. Ligachev went on to dwell on questions of the development of agricultural production and the basic directions of contemporary agrarian policy. The policy devised by the party is already producing certain results. But there has been no fundamental change as yet. The countryside is technically and socially backward. Storage and processing facilities and food industry have been neglected. For this reason it is necessary to buttress correct agrarian policy with significant additional financial and material-technical resources and price reform in the agroindustrial complex. I support the peasant being given freedom and his being master on the land, Ye.K. Ligachev said, but I doubt that he will be able to feed the country with fork and spade. Without large-scale collective agricultural production and its specialization and concentration and without the kolkhozes and sovkhozes [collective and state farms] and the restructuring of their production relations and a strong material-technical base of the countryside we shall not succeed.

Speaking of the social and political situation in the country, Ye.K. Ligachev observed in conclusion that granted all the shortcomings and weaknesses of perestroyka, the vast majority of the people does not conceive of the future of our state without socialist renewal. But at the same time many nationalist, separatist, and simply anti-Soviet forces have emerged here which are endeavoring to foil perestroyka to the benefit of their egotistical, arrogant interests. Even in our party there are people who are not only participating in, but even heading these nationalist, antisocialist movements. One would have to be blind not to see that the entire campaign directed against the party, against the army, and against the law enforcement authorities has been organized and coordinated, and that it is making common cause with outside forces. It is necessary to

bring firm order to bear by political means and the force of the law. We have strong forces which are prepared to defend to the end the unity and integrity of our state. Despite all the complexities and difficulties, we may look to the future with optimism.

Ye.K. Ligachev noted the patriotic position of the veterans in the struggle to uphold socialist ideas and their active work to eradicate bureaucratism in the party and in society and educate the younger generation.

Ye.K. Ligachev then answered numerous questions which were put to him.

Party veterans displayed particular interest in the German question.

Things are moving in the direction, Ye.K. Ligachev emphasized, of FRG politicians, taking advantage of the German people's attraction to unification, having thought up the creation of a united Germany on the basis of their own bourgeois values. As we can see, this has nothing in common with a rectification of mistakes made in the GDR and a restructuring of socialism. It is in fact a question of liquidation of the socialist society and the absorption of the GDR.

Two German states are a factor of peace and stability in Europe. Understandable unease is surfacing among our people in connection with the plans for the creation of a united Germany and its planned incorporation into NATO. The lessons of history cannot be forgotten, and we are responsible for the present and the future.

The first to speak in the debate was USSR People's Deputy A.P. Sitnikov, chairman of the Rostov City Veterans Council. The draft platform, he said, is broadly supported and approved among veterans, although we believe that the Central Committee is behind in its evaluation of political events in the country. This is leading to antisocialist forces having a preemptive opportunity for criticism of the party and for arrogating to themselves what has been done by the CPSU.

We veterans are troubled; what are we ultimately building? Humane, democratic socialism is as yet a slogan and has yet to acquire definite shape. And it needs to be elaborated more rapidly. The Property Act adopted by the Supreme Soviet does not, in my view, guarantee that we will build socialism. The third congress removed from Chapter 2 of the Constitution the directive to the effect that the economic basis of our society is composed of socialist ownership of the means of production. Whichever kind of ownership finds its feet, it is said, such will our system be.

The political instability in society has brought about mental ferment among the veterans also. Unfortunately, at the elections to the local soviets and the republic supreme soviets they did not vote even for the comrades nominated by the veterans' organization.

The party Central Committee and the government do not, as I believe, support the veterans' organization and are not seeking support therein, although there are 60 million of us. Specifically, at the Second Congress of People's Deputies not one of us was called to speak on the government program. I wished to speak at the third congress. I put my name down. I demanded that I be called. But I was not recognized. This is, I believe, disrespect for the older generation.

One further point. Men of the front are still on the apartment waiting list. We are ashamed to look these people in the eye. Forty-five years have elapsed since the victory, and they are still pleading, beseeching, and sobbing. To cater for these people we need to adopt the decision that 20 percent of the housing built this year be allocated to war veterans.

Marshal of Aviation A.P. Silantyev, chairman of the Soviet War Veterans Committee and USSR people's deputy, spoke. Forty-five years have passed, he said, since the war ended, and we still have not buried hundreds of thousands of soldiers who fell in battle; they are lying in trenches and craters. This is the country's shame. More than 200 fields still have not been cleared of mines, and no one can set foot there. Who will solve this problem? Only the army— specially trained and equipped troops—can do this. This problem needs to be resolved as quickly as possible.

Look what is being done on Poklonnaya Heights! Everything is being looted. A shameful garbage dump. Nor was or is there any monument to the victors. But things can be put right. What is needed? This work needs to be headed by people with a conscience.

There are 60 million of us veterans. Plus our influence on those alongside us. This is a huge force which has not in the present difficult situation changed its socialist ideals. It is devoted to the party cause and is loyally serving its people. We are with the party and only with the party, we cannot conceive of ourselves without this. The party leadership needs to take this into consideration in its day-to-day work and to meet with veteran activists. We meanwhile see among ourselves a member of the Central Committee Politburo for the first time. And we say: Thank you.

USSR People's Deputy V.Ya. Azarov, chairman of the Moscow Oblast council, mounted the podium:

The draft platform says that the party Central Committee will exert ideological influence on the mass news media and combat disinformation and their use for personal egotistical interests and to incite interethnic discord and propagandize ideas alien to humanism and democratic socialism. A correct proposition, and we support it. The newspapers cannot be permitted to defame the party, the army, and honest, decent people and to paint history, in which there have been many heroic, shining pages, only in black colors. Some press organs are portraying veterans also as slaves of the Stalin regime, conservatives, and enemies of perestroyka, but they fought heroically at the front, not sparing their lives, and resurrected cities and villages from the ashes.

Can we put up with the fact that the Komsomol [Communist Youth League] press is not popularizing labor, but sex and prostitution? This is evoking anger and indignation.

The draft platform, USSR People's Deputy A.Ye. Andreyev, chairman of the Belorussian Republic Council, said, may be taken as a basis. But further work and a more in-depth comprehension of what is happening in our life are needed, of course. We have much, very much today that is negative. Interethnic friction is spreading, there are manifestations of separatism and anti-Sovietism. I believe that this points to lacunae in the work of a number of leaders of the Central Committee. They are divorced from reality, do not visit the localities, and do not know the situation. If they do go anywhere, they then draw the wrong conclusions. I shall not speak anonymously. Both Comrade A.N. Yakovlev and Comrade V.A. Medvedev declared, having visited the Baltic republics: "Nothing special is going on, everything is normal!" When he visited us in Minsk and addressed a meeting of activists, Comrade V.A. Medvedev was addressed by one worker and advised: "Here we have three members of the Politburo who have visited the Baltic, but look what is happening there...." "Everything is normal there," V.A. Medvedev replied. This is to what this "normal" has led: Lithuania has declared that it is seceding from the Soviet Union.

Nor can I agree with liberalism in respect of people who have brought disgrace on the party. They have retired on pension and continue to live a life of ease and to enjoy privileges. Are such things possible? I am not saying they should be jailed (although they should be), but why keep in the party people who have disgraced themselves?

We are very disturbed by the fact that a split in the veterans' organization has emerged. A League of Armed Forces Veterans has been formed in Moscow. And with us in Belorussia some people intend officially forming a union whose main mission will be "struggle against the Soviet and party bureaucracy." And its entire charter is geared solely to achieving social benefits. We will, I believe, only be able to reliably uphold the interests of the older generation when all our forces are consolidated.

USSR People's Deputy K.F. Kravchenko, chairman of the Maritime Kray Council, spoke of the need to step up the fight against crime. Well-considered measures to combat this evil should be set forth in the draft platform for the 28th party congress.

While in Japan, K.F. Kravchenko continued, USSR People's Deputy Yu.N. Afanasyev said that the Kuriles were not ours and that they should therefore be given back or sold or that something else should be done with them. Who gave him the right to speak in this way?! Why has there been no reaction to such shameless statements?

G.R. Udarov, member of the all-union council, spoke fervently and heatedly about a painful matter. A struggle of shady forces is currently underway against the party for power and representation in the soviets. What is particularly offensive is that many of the mass media have in fact left the party and are beyond its control. I believe, G.R. Udarov said, that the Central Committee should effectively influence the mass media and lead them ideologically.

There are now many volunteers for heaping dirt on our army. They are also to be found among the USSR people's deputies. The question of a quota for workers and peasants and of their representation in the state and party authorities has been rightly raised here.

A.G. Polyakova, member of the all-union council, said in her speech that the draft platform is in need of additional work and adjustments. We need to emphasize therein that harmful and heavy work is not for women and that protection of people's health is a public task which concerns all departments, enterprises, and establishments. Questions of environmental protection should be presented in the platform not vaguely, but more specifically.

S.S. Samryakov, representative of the Leningrad veterans' organization, substantiated in his speech the need for the creation of a Russian Communist Party.

A.I. Golyakov, first deputy chairman of the all-union council, notified the participants in the plenum of the measures connected with the upcoming commemoration of the 45th anniversary of the victory in the Great Patriotic War.

Having discussed the draft platform of the CPSU Central Committee for the 28th party congress, the all-union council plenum adopted an appeal to the CPSU Central Committee (published in this issue).

Democratic Platform's Shostakovskiy Cited

90UN1238A Moscow UCHITELSKAYA GAZETA in Russian No 11, Mar 90 p 5

[Report on interview with V. Shostakovskiy by L. Timofeyeva: "Movement Left?"]

[Text] It is difficult to predict today amid the political Babel—at times aggressive, at times pacificatory—what turn events will take next. Certain party leaders and communists have, it would seem, put their trust wholly in the elements or are once again awaiting solutions "from above." But there are people who prefer to struggle under these circumstances also. A version of a solution to the crisis proposed by the "Democratic Platform" movement was published in PRAVDA on 3 March. Our correspondent interviewed Professor V. Shostakovskiy, member of the "Democratic Platform" movement's coordinating council and dean of Moscow's Higher Party School.

[Timofeyeva] Vyacheslav Nikolayevich, the All-Union Conference of Party Clubs and Party Organizations of the country, which was convened in January on the initiative of the Moscow "Communists for Perestroyka" Club, was not a run-of-the-mill event. The conference

announced the founding in the CPSU of the "Democratic Platform" movement and adopted a declaration on its immediate aims.

[Shostakovskiy] I believe that the reasons and need for this conference had taken shape in considerable numbers of communists because on the one hand they were dissatisfied with the way in which the renewal of the CPSU was going and, on the other, wanted to assume responsibility for its restructuring themselves. The hour of self-determination had struck.

People attended the conference in a variety of moods. Calls for a withdrawal from the party or the immediate organization of a social democratic structure were heard. But the vast majority of conferees agreed that it was necessary to work on renewal of the party within the party itself.

[Timofeyeva] Nonetheless, is the "DP" a wing or a faction in the party?

[Shostakovskiy] It is not a faction but a platform, and it has not been structured organizationally, incidentally. Its main task is performing analytical work in the primary organizations. The main thing is that the platform is open to all communists. Obviously you wish to ask why the calls for a withdrawal from the party were not supported?

[Timofeyeva] Yes, after all, Yu. Afanasyev and G. Popov spoke about this.

[Shostakovskiy] I believe that the majority of conferees acted responsibly, recognizing that our party has valuable human capital and considerable intellectual forces. And that people who have yet to finally determine their position and who at the same time are dissatisfied with the course of affairs in the party and society cannot be left to the whim of fate. We will work within the party, seeking radical changes in its policy. I believe that the endless compromises, tardiness, indecisiveness, half-measures and "centrist" orientation have exhausted themselves. Compromise is a necessary element of the political art, but it cannot be the basis and core of policy. Policy must be effective. This is why we are for a movement leftward from the center and for the consolidation of all forces that advocate democratic change both in society and in the party.

[Timofeyeva] Are there fundamental differences between your document and the CPSU Central Committee platform for the congress?

[Shostakovskiy] There are, but there are also many positions in common.

We are opposed to Article 6 of the constitution, but support a real multiparty system and are, therefore, opposed to the concept of the party's vanguard role. We propose the creation of a parliamentary-type party. And although this is one of the most contentious issues, we are convinced that this is the way of the future.

[Timofeyeva] What do you think, what legal provisions should be determined for the party in the Constitution instead of Article 6?

[Shostakovskiy] The "Political System" section spoke of the political responsibility of political parties and of public and political organizations. But considering that we are approaching a real multiparty system, we will soon need a law on parties that does not dictate the internal mechanisms of parties' arrangement but determines the conditions of their political activity in society in interaction with the state structures.

[Timofeyeva] The conference advanced the idea of the direct, secret, multiple-choice elections of delegates to the congress.

[Shostakovskiy] The problem of elections has indeed acquired exceptional political seriousness. This is not a procedural issue. The multistage traditional elections could even at the stage of preparation for the congress undermine trust in it. It is up to the party Central Committee to have the decisive say now.

The Democratic Platform resolution on elections records: "We appeal to members of the CPSU Central Committee, considering the revolutionary nature of perestroyka and the immense significance of the 28th CPSU Congress, that they assume the fullness of historical responsibility and suspend Section 44 of the CPSU Rules and cancel the old instructions concerning elections of executive party authorities, adopting a decision on direct elections to the congress by party district." I personally believe that if this proposal is not supported, it will be necessary to form a democratic faction in the party and attend the congress for all that. It is difficult to say what the coordinating council will decide.

[Timofeyeva] The resolution of the 10th congress prohibiting any factionalism within the party is well known. What do we do in this regard?

[Shostakovskiy] Yes, the 10th Russian Communist Party (Bolshevik) Congress in 1921 passed the resolution "Party Unity," which permits platforms, but not factions. We do not have a mechanism for revising decisions adopted previously, even if they are hopelessly out of date. This is why in one of our documents we propose the revision of the decisions of the 10th congress.

[Timofeyeva] Nonetheless, Vyacheslav Nikolayevich, does the appearance of the "DP" not testify to the start of a split in the party?

[Shostakovskiy] I have already heard such rebukes. But this, in my view, shows a misunderstanding of the situation. A split in the party might occur not on the initiative of the "DP," but as a result of the passiveness of the CPSU leadership. The "Democratic Platform" is creating a different situation: an opportunity for democratic communists to realize themselves through support for its basic ideas. There will most likely be losses. If these positions are approved, some people will leave the

party and create their own, possibly.... Do not look for a split here—look for a desire to ascertain a pole around which something could take shape, form, and develop. This does not mean that we all think identically and that there is no difference between us. But if Yuriy Afanasyev, who adheres to social democratic standpoints, has associated himself with the "DP," this is, in my view, a sign of the strength, not weakness, of the ideas of the "DP."

[Timofeyeva] There are many people of the pedagogical intelligentsia among the participants in the conference and the movement. How do you explain this fact?

[Shostakovskiy] This is true. How do I explain it? Primarily, obviously, by the fact that the intelligentsia has become politicized earlier and in greater depth than other social strata. It was essentially taking part in mass meetings even in the stagnation years. Even if these meetings were held in the kitchen, they were held. By virtue of this, it has proven very receptive to the idea of perestroyka.

Democratic Platform Accused of Factionalism

PM1704110090 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Apr 90 First Edition p 2

[Article by Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Professor Colonel V. Davydov under the rubric "Precongress Platform: The Party and Perestroyka": "Who Is Working Toward a Split"]

[Text] Today we are increasingly frequently encountering situations where perestroyka slogans, apparent "boldness" of expressions, and "radical" premises conceal an unexplained hostility to the CPSU and shameless appropriation of its constructive, reforming ideas. When methods like these are employed by anticommunist groups and associations, that is understandable: The ideological struggle continues in the public awareness, however much we may talk of "deideologization." But when people who call themselves members of the CPSU adopt positions that virtually amount to its negation, then this gives rise to some perplexity.

Something that deserves first and foremost a critical assessment as an attempt to attack the CSPU "from within" is the so-called "Democratic Platform," which, on careful reading, turns out not to be the platform of a working party at all, since it does not cover part of the range of perestroyka problems, but reduces everything to just one question—that of "radical reform" of the party. Well, that is an extremely important question. But let us see in what respects and on what points the "radical reform" of the CPSU is proposed. Without claiming to make a full analysis, I think it is sufficient to concentrate on four of these points.

First, the "Democratic Platform" claims that the starting point of the crisis in the CPSU is a "crisis of communist ideology," that "in the light of the new political thinking the bankruptcy and immorality of many of the means and methods by which the proclaimed goals were sought have become apparent...," and that the seven "dogmatic ideas" making up that ideology need radical revision.

That is trenchant and accusatory, but the question must be approached in a businesslike manner.

As chief of the social sciences faculty at an academic higher educational establishment I know from experience that in recent years many theoretical problems of philosophy, political economy, scientific socialism, political science, teaching on war and peace, and other spheres of social science forming the ideological and theoretical baggage of the Communist Party have been and are being subjected to a major revision. The revision and renewal of this baggage is not an end in itself, but an integral part of the revolutionary renewal of the CPSU. And it is not, of course, a question of a crisis of communist ideology, which has always been capable of self-renewal, but of a crisis of the established stereotype of its dogmatic immutability. The establishment of this stereotype was in effect a betrayal of communist ideology itself. After all, it is based on the method of dialectical philosophy, in which, as F. Engels explained, there is nothing that is established once and for all, nothing unconditional....

Incidentally, the "radical reformers" should remember that the ideas of the new political thinking, in the light of which they accuse the CPSU of "immorality of means and methods," were put forward by the CPSU itself at the beginning of perestroyka, before the radical reformers saw the light of day. But even that is beside the point. While reproaching the CPSU and indicating what should be discarded from its theoretical baggage, they say nothing about the positive elements that should be preserved and developed, that is, in effect they confine themselves to unadorned, futile negation. In this respect the CPSU Central Committee platform is considerably superior. The radical reformers would be well advised to study its first section: This states exhaustively what should be resolutely rejected and what should be preserved in the party's ideological and political arsenal.

Second, the authors of the "Democratic Platform" state categorically that the CPSU ceased many years ago to be a political party and that "having provided the impetus for economic and political reform," it is supposedly incapable of "taking the processes of perestroyka to their logical conclusion," because it has not embarked on "a radical revision of its own role in society, its own democratic reform."

These totally unsubstantiated assertions contain open untruths and logical absurdities. A "nonpolitical organization" cannot give society any kind of "political impetus." Yet the CPSU, by means of its political analysis of the existing situation prior to the 27th CPSU Congress, did not merely "provide the impetus," but launched a process of politicization of the masses on a huge scale. It was the CPSU, at its 19th party conference, which defined urgent measures in the practical implementation

of the reform of the country's political system and the tasks of democratization of Soviet society. It was the CPSU, in the draft Central Committee platform for the 28th party congress which is now under discussion, which specified clearly that it "does not assume state powers. Its role is to be the democratically recognized political leader operating through the communists, without laying claim to preferential treatment or to its special position being enshrined in the USSR Constitution." All these are facts, and they expose the demagogic nature of the assertions made by the authors of the "Democratic Platform."

At the same time we should evidently heed their critical observation on the danger of allowing the process of democratization of the party itself to lag behind the democratization of society. This danger does indeed exist, but so does the danger of "spurring on" the social process too energetically, anticipating events, and making unrealistic, ultraradical demands.

Third, the "Democratic Platform" strikes its main blow, so to speak, against the principle of democratic centralism, seeing this as "the main cementing component of an undemocratic nature" both in the party and in the entire political system.

But let us look at the substance of the matter.

CPSU Central Committee documents show very constructively that the application of the principle of democratic centralism as the basis for the organizational structure of a party under renewal means shifting the emphasis to the democratic aspect of it. In other words, the principle itself should be reinterpreted and regenerated, with its true revolutionary democratic content.

But the authors of the "Democratic Platform" reject it out of hand, putting forward six "crushing arguments" which in fact simply do not stand up to criticism.

Judge for yourselves. The "charges" laid against democratic centralism are:

—first, that it fails to ensure true pluralism of opinion and the possibility of criticizing the adoption of a decision. That is not true. The existence of the "Democratic Platform" itself today and of other platforms and declarations, their broad discussion by communists, and finally the right enshrined in the Statutes to criticize decisions adopted earlier by any party organ testify precisely to the vitality of this principle;

—second, that it fails to ensure the protection of the rights of the minority, which often generates innovative ideas. This is also untrue. The protection of "the rights of the minority" is in no way contrary to democratic centralism, and the draft new CPSU Statutes enshrine the methods of such protection (see Section II, Article 13);

—third, that it does not give the right to make decisions to those who are directly affected by the said decisions, and that it prescribes unfailing subordination of lower-level organizations to higher-level organizations on all questions. This is also not so. This charge can be refuted merely by studying the second section of the draft new CPSU Statutes, defining the essence and nature of intraparty democracy. The CPSU Central Committee Platform associates the renewal of the party primarily with an increase in the role and power of the party masses and the expansion of the rights and autonomy of primary organizations. As for subordination, we are talking about an organization, and that always presupposes a certain hierarchy, otherwise you cannot have a properly organized party capable of functioning;

—fourth, that it "bans the formation of horizontal links within the party." Once again, this is an inversion of the truth. On the contrary, it presupposes this very thing: Article 17 of the draft party Statutes, which asserts the principle of democratic centralism, explains that within the party "councils of secretaries of party organizations, party clubs, theoretical seminars, discussion centers, and other forms of party work uniting communists on the basis of interests and problems may be set up and operate;"

—fifth, that it "dictates iron discipline in performance, ruling out the creative principle and activeness from below." This claim is simply absurd. The CPSU is a voluntary union, a self-managing social and political organization, and its performance discipline is conscious and voluntary in nature. And this is in no way at odds with creative activity on the part of a communist;

—and, last, that it does not allow CPSU members who are elected as people's deputies to express the will of their voters, rather than of higher-level party organizations. It is hard to say which is more evident in this assertion—prejudice, or elementary ignorance. After all, the supporters of the "Democratic Platform" themselves admit that "the CPSU should win the right to political leadership exclusively in elections, and maintain it with its theoretical and practical activity." Let us note that this proposition is not original. The draft CPSU Central Committee Platform says it more clearly: The party will struggle to maintain the position of ruling party within the framework of the democratic process by seeking to win votes in elections so as to secure the people's mandate for the formation of leadership organs....

But if you acknowledge this propostion, it is necessary also to acknowledge the self-evident fact that if the voters have voted for a communist deputy, they have voted for the authority of the CPSU. And the deputy cannot let them down. If a communist becomes a deputy under some other slogan, for instance, on the strength of the blatant promises of populist demagoguery, he is expressing neither the will, nor the interests, nor the objectives of the CPSU.

There would be no need to discuss this at such length if, after thus rejecting the principle of democratic centralism, the leaders of the "Democratic Platform" in the CPSU had proposed anything new or original. But alas, they only proposed replacing it with "democratic principles," by which, it seems, they mean: the electoral principle, glasnost, replaceability of leaders, subjugation of the minority to the majority, and statutory guarantees of the protection of the minority's rights.

Excuse me! These are precisely the basic characteristics of democratic centralism, outlined in detail in the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform. Why be so zealous in breaking down an open door?

Fourth, this is in essence the most important point. Behind this "uncompromising" struggle against the principle of democratic centralism, among a great many categorical and maximalist utterances, among a whole collection of genuinely democratic, though not new, slogans, a demand is voiced somehow imperceptibly, "unobtrusively," in the form of an entirely commonplace and ordinary proposition—the demand to "return to freedom of factions, groupings, and ideological currents by revoking the 10th Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Congress resolution 'On Party Unity.'"

It is legitimate to ask: Who needs this, and why? It is well known that a "faction" is an isolated section of a political party with its own views and platform that differ from the party's views and platform, with its own discipline, and—this is the most unacceptable feature—engaging in a struggle against the party while remaining for a time within its ranks, splitting the party from within.

Is that what the leaders of "reformism" want? The program for "radical reform" of the CPSU which they have submitted presupposes that in the guise of an organizational demarcation between radicals and conservatives different ideological currents, platforms, and factions will spring up within the party, which could "form a basis for the emergence of several political parties offering different models of socialism and ways of achieving them." In essence the objective here is not democratic reform of the party, but to break up and disarm the CPSU, rob it of its important consolidating role, and ultimately weaken it through an internal factional struggle.

In the conditions of glasnost and real pluralism of opinion, the supporters of the "Democratic Platform," if they are not satisfied with the Central Committee platform, could simply leave the CPSU and form their own party. They are not doing that. But nor are they proposing anything more radical and constructive than there is in the CPSU Central Committee Platform. Behind this is the hope of winning mandates from congress delegates, and that way lies division. And after that, evidently, claims to the party's property and to the truth in the last instance. What lies behind all this is the desire to weaken the party's influence.

The "Democratic Platform" claims a very special position among the other so-called alternative platforms. The leaders of this roganized movement are more active than anyone else. No sooner has the CPSU Central Committee's Open Letter to the country's communists been published, than at once there is an accusation (see the latest issue of the newspaper ARGUMENTY I FAKTY) of Stalinism and of attempted reprisals against dissidents; at once there is name-calling and accusations of conservatism against those who do not adhere to their positions. And they assert in vain that the Open Letter to communists is the work of the conservative apparatus. It is the collective work of the Central Committee, expressing the feelings of many millions of communists. It calls for clear dissociation both from conservatives and from the zealous proponents of a split. And, most important, it calls for consolidation. It is crucial to understand that.

Only just over two months remain before the 28th congress, which should indisputably be the congress of a party in the course of renewal, reform, and profound perestroyka, capable in practice of being the political vanguard of society as a whole and leading it toward a humane, democratic socialism. It is important today to overcome "mental confusion," so that every communist can correctly determine his own position, his own choice.

Party Apparatus' Role, Position Viewed

PM0504110590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Apr 90 Second Edition p 2

[Article by V. Ryabov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Apparatus Party Committee, under the rubric "Discussion Platform": "Whom the Apparatus Serves"]

[Text] Pluralism of opinions and views and, recently, the increasing confrontation among different political forces and movements are becoming an increasingly characteristic sign of the present stage of perestroyka. There are not that many realities in our life today upon which public opinion is agreed. Among them we could infallibly name the universal recognition of the need for perestroyka and also the negative attitude that has taken shape toward the activity of the party, soviet, and state apparatus.

The demands for the bureaucracy to be scrapped, which give rise to no doubts, are being replaced by increasingly categorical calls for the abolition of every apparatus. Total rejection of the CPSU apparatus is primarily being incited, for it is said to be the chief and almost the only opponent of perestroyka. I have no wish to engage in whitewashing it—this is a thankless task. But I consider it essential to share with the readers some thoughts about this and to call for all-around comprehension of the purpose and functions of the apparatus in the overall context of the party's renewal.

Such a question would appear not to exist in everyday consciousness, just as it does not exist for many mass media. An unambiguously affirmative answer is given to it.

Arguments which appear convincing—at first sight—are advanced. Since the party apparatus is being deprived of commanding functions and powers, it simply cannot fail to act as a powerful brake on transformations. The apparatus is said to work for rations, not for ideas. Its representatives are able to do nothing in life but uncontrolledly goad people by means of lower party organizations—which is passed off as leadership. Therefore, they struggle desperately not just for their positions but to preserve their very way of living and acting. Proceeding from this premise, it is easy to peremptorily accuse all party workers both of past misfortunes and of present and future miscalculations. An elementary way out is proposed: Away with the apparatus, and there will be no problems.

If there is a grain of truth in the cited arguments, it is only in the initial premise. In the fact that all the fullness of power in a renewed socialist state can belong only to the people, not to the party nor, still less, the apparatus. As for the conclusions, I am sure that they require more profound comprehension and sober, mature assessments.

First, the entire process of the political system's democratic renewal, the constitutional changes, the economic transformations, and the perestroyka in the party itself are aimed at asserting socialist people's power. So, to reduce all the problems that arise here to nothing more than surmounting the conservative role of the apparatus means to inadmissibly oversimplify the situation, to say the least, and to swap over causes and effects.

Second, according to common sense, it is absurd to accuse the party apparatus of deliberately preserving a crisis situation. No crisis in society is ever in the interests of the ruling party, including its apparatus, still less under conditions of increasing political pluralism, on the threshold of a multiparty system.

On the contrary, it is advantageous to the forces which are forming an opposition and trying to create their own structures, including their own apparatus, to escalate instability and uncertainty and to fan general dissatisfaction in order to maintain a situation favorable to themselves so as to throw the entire party onto the "sacrifical altar" and remove the CPSU from the political arena under slogans of struggle against the domination of the apparatus and against the "partocracy."

Third, the image of the party worker as a limited yet resourceful person, who advances effortlessly and undeservedly up the nomenklatura ladder, is very important to these forces for propaganda purposes. It is not difficult to corroborate it with impressive examples. The particular type of prosperous apparatchik, who displays miraculous versatility and tenacity and casts a dark shadow over the whole party apparatus, is still fresh in people's memory. They even included people who managed to hold out for 20-30 years on the Central Committee apparatus alone—from Stalin through Gorbachev. The activity of the apparatus is firmly linked in people's minds with those leaders whose names became symbols of corruption and lawlessness.

But today other people are being advanced into party work. The party apparatus has now been significantly reduced and its composition substantially renewed. There has been an appreciable increase in the intellectual potential of full-time party workers.

In my opinion, answers to different questions must be sought. The following problem is topical and urgent—what should the apparatus be like and what place must it occupy in the renewed party? There is no doubt about the need for its fundamental reorganization.

In the broad sense the apparatus is, by definition, a system of organizations and establishments serving some sphere of management of an economic or other field of activity. In a narrower sense, it is the aggregate of the workers of these organizations and establishments. Of course, any apparatus serves to realize the managerial principles that operate in society.

The excessive nationalization of property and the concentration of economic and political power in the hands of central state and party organs predetermined the nature of our apparatus' activity. Its functions included not so much preparing analytical and expert materials as shaping decisions, organizing the execution of adopted decisions, and rigidly controlling the activity of party and state organs. This principle permeated the entire structure of society from top to bottom, forming the linchpin of the administrative edict system which gave rise to man's profound alienation from property and from power and the no lesser alienation of the mass of communists from active involvement in political and economic life. Its dismantling is perestroyka's aim in the course of the reforms that are being carried out in the country, including in the party itself.

Does this mean that the apparatus is obsolete and that it can essentially be only an adjunct of the edict bureaucracy and solely an element of the usurpation of power? This is hardly a valid way of formulating the question.

The need, for example, to attach groups of advisers and experts to USSR people's deputies very quickly became apparent. Does their assistance have any impact on decisions adopted by the Supreme Soviet? Undoubtedly. But this is in no way a negative fact. The need for competent service in the process of formulating and adopting decisions under conditions of broad democracy is not lessening but increasing, and has already been manifested quite acutely. No organ of state or political power and no public organizations can operate normally without a qualified apparatus of organizers, consultants, and advisers.

We have recently been turning increasingly frequently to foreign experience, but without always adapting it adequately to our own conditions. In the United States a very large body of highly qualified specialists, closely linked with the leading political parties, is involved in serving legislative and executive organs at all levels. Of course, the correlation of the party and the state apparatus there is different to ours in terms of both size and functions. But when the ruling party changes, all key posts are filled by its representatives, whom no one elects democratically. In this way a powerful party and state apparatus is formed, which acts as an instrument for realizing the commanding powers that have been attained.

Our recent practice also confirms that at a certain organizational stage the newly formed associations and public movements are also obliged to create their own apparatus. Take the recent regrouping of managerial functions in the economic sphere. With a cutback of approximately 700,000 people on the upper floors of the apparatus, the number of managers at the middle and lower level of economic management has increased by almost the same amount.

As a result of serious distortions in Soviet society the party found itself built into a rigid administrative edict system. By means of brute force and physical violence, the Stalinist regime introduced into the party methods that were alien to its political activity and to a considerable extent destroyed its link with the people. It usurped the right to act in the name of elected party organs and relied on a narrow circle of functionaries subordinate to its will and on a specially selected apparatus which essentially served an all-embracing system for crushing any dissidence.

During the years of stagnation, when the 20th party congress decisions were surreptitiously revised, the activity of the apparatus was directed, above all, toward apologetics for the status quo. Competence still was not recognized, nor initiative encouraged. Of course, senior officials were always involved in preparing future decisions. But progressive ideas were, as a rule, removed from drafts, and many sensible proposals and realistic assessments of the state of affairs locally were ignored. Nor was support given to a desire to comprehend in depth the situation in society.

In general, and at all stages of our history, the party apparatus lived and was assessed by the norms taking shape in society at the given period, while at the same time remaining the hostage of general policy. As a result, it became what it became but still was not what is must be in a democratic, rule-of-law society. There are now forces which would like to make it a hostage of perestroyka by shaping the image of the finally found "true" universal enemy, whose destruction will resolve all problems once and for all.

In the apparatchik's notes we must not, of course, overlook such an acute question today as apparatus privileges. They are certainly no myth, but the whole truth is not being spoken about them either. It was not so much the fact of belonging to the apparatus as the post held on it that determined the privileged nature of the position. And this, when it comes down to it, was a consequence of distortions in realizing the socialist principle of distribution according to labor. The social value of a person's labor contribution was simply identified with his post. The system of additional payment in kind according to the post held, which was introduced long ago, operated in the party, in the economic sphere, in science, in the mass media—in all structures of society. It has to be broken up everywhere.

Nevertheless, the party—if, of course, it wants to preserve its competence as a political organization—must have a qualified apparatus of the optimum number of full-time workers.

What is the apparatus like at the end of the fifth year of perestroyka? What principles does it preach? Whose will does it carry out?

Under the new conditions the apparatus, remaining strictly subordinate to elected party organs, must serve the constructive development of the democratic process and be a reliable instrument for the organic combination of broad democracy with competence in resolving the most important problems of party life. Both its modern functions and certain demands on the workers themselves stem from this.

As secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Apparatus Party Committee, I chat with new workers, cooperate with them in everyday work, and have a personal idea of these people. So, who has joined us? Above all, a considerable group of young scientists from VUZ's [higher educational institutions], academy institutes, and party scientific establishments specializing in problems of social policy, spiritual culture, and ideology. Among the senior officials today there are 73 doctors and almost 350 candidates of sciences, many of whom are well known and recognized by the Soviet and foreign scientific public. Another group consists of party workers from the provinces—as a rule, secretaries of large party organizations and of party kray and oblast committees who have been promoted and shown their worth in the course of perestroyka.

The party needs their knowledge, experience, and commitment to the new. I dare to maintain that they were all seeking certainly not a sinecure but active involvement in the radical renewal of society by abruptly changing the nature of their work and their place of residence in complex circumstances and frequently losing out with regard to wages.

At the same time you cannot resolve the problem of creating an efficiently working apparatus just by renewing cadres. In any matter there is inevitably a constant, forced orientation toward the leadership's originally set position. I remember how only quite recently terms such as civil society, political pluralism, farmer,

and farming were struck from draft documents. But they had already been accepted in society and were becoming realities of life, and their recognition in party documents would have removed many questions.

We are constantly late in adopting adequate decisions. Among the few preventive measures to date I could name the initiatives of departments in organizing direct meetings between the country's top political and state leadership and delegates to the All-Union Students Forum and in preparing a special Central Committee Politburo resolution on realizing the students' suggestions. Unfortunately, this is an exception rather than the rule.

In one of their memorandums, CPSU Central Committee departments—having generalized suggestions from the provinces—substantiated a package of measures to significantly broaden the independence of primary party organizations. However, the decision boiled down to an unconvincing, limited experiment of granting to a group of large organizations the right to admit people to the CPSU without a period as a candidate member and leaving an insignificant proportion of party dues at their disposal. Naturally, this shift satisfied no one.

As much as two years ago suggestions were being submitted to grant students a deferment from the army draft and to restructure officer training in VUZ's along voluntary lines and on the principle of maximum approximation to their future civilian specialty. This viewpoint was not supported at the time. A short while later it had to be hastily elaborated and implemented, but this time under pressure from public opinion. Enterprising analytical memorandums from Central Committee departments are still only becoming the norm, although a certain mistrust of them still tells.

Life itself is making us abandon direct guidance and constant tutelage of local party organs and party organizations of state establishments. The paramount task is to jointly comprehend the situation that is taking shape, reveal the dominant trends, and master modern methods of forecasting. Surprising though it may be, there is now no statute at all on CPSU Central Committee departments, and their duties do not include such tasks.

Without this it is impossible to elaborate a realistic, outstripping policy. Party workers, like all communists, have the right to openly express their views on any problem and to participate in an all-party debate not as prescribed but in accordance with their own conviction, including within the framework of their own party organization. The party committee's policy is that our communists should really acquire this possibility.

Responding to the demands of the time, we must vigorously seek appropriate paths. The attention of the apparatus is concentrated on analyzing socioeconomic problems of society's development and current sociopolitical processes. To this end we actively study public opinion, arrange cooperation with people's deputies and the mass media, and endeavor to attract prominent specialists.

The results of the recent All-Union Seminar of VUZ Party Organization Secretaries are interesting from this viewpoint. Members and candidate members of the Politburo, secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee, leaders of the State Committee for Public Education and of other interested ministries and departments, prominent scientists, and representatives of the press participated in the work of its discussion centers. There was a direct and frank exchange of opinions on very topical and acute problems of perestroyka in the party and of the reform of higher education.

As a result of the discussion that took place, more than 200 suggestions connected with preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress and with the draft Central Committee Platform and party Statutes were forwarded directly to the CPSU Central Committee, and many of them were taken into account in the final version of the published documents. Three secretaries of leading VUZ party committees participated in the February plenum.

One more point. Having announced its abandonment of political hegemony, the party must be ready to use democratic methods in the struggle for power. Unfortunately, this very important area of party activity today does not feature at all in the CPSU Central Committee Platform for the upcoming congress, whereas the opposition is operating actively and energetically. Obviously, the problem will be raised in the process of discussion and be taken into account in the final version of the document. The apparatus, too, must prepare in earnest for this—let us be frank—difficult work.

The thought was aired at the Central Committee February Plenum that a clear and distinct definition of the level of competence for all party organs, including the party apparatus, and the setting of a limit on the powers of each one of them, which can under no conditions be exceeded, could be one guarantee of the democratization of party life. I support that proposal.

It seems to contain qualitatively new approaches to a modern understanding of the principle of democratic centralism. The centralized principle operates only in the period between congresses and conferences and within the framework of the powers delegated to the party's corresponding elected organs. At the same time their activity on the most important questions will be under the constant control of the broad party masses. Such questions will be able to be resolved only with the use of party debates, referendums, and other democratic forms of the free expression of the will of communists. I believe that this should be reflected in the new party Statutes.

Then no one will be able to speak in the name of the whole party. Everyone will bear his own share of duties and his own measure of responsibility before it. Under these conditions the apparatus will occupy its proper place.

Charity To Help Child Victims of Nuclear Tests

LD1004221390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1103 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] Alma-Ata, 10 Apr (TASS)—TASS correspondent Aleksandr Vodolazov reports:

Today the founding conference of a charity fund "For the Child Victims of Nuclear Tests" was held here.

"The fund's aim is to ease the lot of sick children and invalids, and to help orphans and families with many children," a TASS correspondent was told by writer Rollan Seysenbayev, president of the new fund. "It is planned to construct clinics, to fit them with modern equipment, to strengthen the material base of existing health-care establishments in the region, and to organize treatment of the children at sanatoria and resorts, and leisure for them."

The founders of the fund are the "Nevada-Semipalatinsk" antinuclear movement, the Soviet Peace Committee, the USSR Literary Fund, the Soviet Children's Fund, a number of enterprises and higher educational establishments in the oblast, and the editorial boards of a number of local newspapers. Donations have already been received from literary and public firms and from various firms in Japan, Finland, Hungary, and the FRG.

Moscow Hosts Roundtable on Lenin's Significance

PM1204105490 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Apr 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "The Most Influential Person of the Century"]

[Text] Twentieth-century world history is inconceivable without V.I. Lenin and his ideas and actions. A major reformer and revolutionary, scholar, and founder of the first socialist state, he is still with us today. The true greatness of Lenin's ideas can be felt particularly keenly now—at a time of radical transformations in Soviet society and life-giving processes of socialist renewal. This was the subject of discussion at an international "roundtable" on "The Ideas of V.I. Lenin and the Future of Socialism" in Moscow on 5 April.

The speech by P.V. Volobuyev, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, noted the need to stop the canonization of the leader of the proletarian revolution as an individual and the embellishment of his thoughts. In the course of the complex processes that were taking place at the dawn of the century in Russia, his approaches to their historical interpretation developed dialectically, as is the case with any real scholar. One graphic example of this is Ilich's conclusions and subsequent attitude to the policy of war communism. Thus at the turning points of history his views on socialism and Russia's future were continously enriched.

Professor Robert Tucker of Princeton University (United States) called V.I. Lenin the most influential figure of the century. The inspirer of October, the American scholar said, takes the main credit for the emergence of a strong new state—Soviet Russia. Describing Lenin as a major enlightener, the professor expressed the view that in our day he would have been an ardent supporter of the policy of "new thinking" and resolute renewal of political structures in the Soviet Union.

Officials Sign Obituary of Musician Mark Fradkin

PM1104141190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Apr 90 Second Edition p 8

[Undated obituary: "Mark Grigoryevich Fradkin"]

[Excerpts] Multinational Soviet culture has suffered a painful loss. USSR People's Artist Mark Grigoryevich Fradkin, one of the country's major musical artists, has passed away after a prolonged illness. [passage omitted]

V.I. Vorotnikov, V.A. Medvedev, A.V. Vlasov, Yu.A. Prokofyev, Ch. Aytmatov, I.K. Arkhipova, A.A. Belyayev, M.I. Blanter, N.V. Bogoslovskiy, N.N. Gubenko, G.P. Dmitriyev, Ye.A. Dolmatovskiy, V.K. Yegorov, L.G. Zykina, V.I. Kazenin, A.S. Kapto, E.G. Klimov, I.D. Kobzon, G.I. Mayboroda, Yu.S. Melentyev, A.N. Pakhmutova, V.G. Rasputin, R.I. Rozhdestvenskiy, N.I. Sats, B.S. Ugarov, T.N. Khrennikov, R.K. Shchedrin.

Amnesty International Chief Notes Soviet Progress

LD1604154590 Moscow TASS in English 1437 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 16 TASS—By TASS correspondent Ruben Shirinyan:

"A number of positive changes in the domain of human rights have occurred in the USSR in recent years. It is gratifying to note that these changes are continuing," Ian Martin, secretary general of Amnesty International, told TASS during a visit to Moscow at the invitation of the State and Law Institute under the USSR Academy of Sciences.

"A further improvement of the human rights situation in the USSR depends on the adoption of corresponding laws and this process is being actively promoted," Martin noted. He expressed satisfaction with the fact that Amnesty International representatives were allowed to take part in the discussion on human rights in the USSR and to express their views.

Martin said that Amnesty International's meetings with Soviet lawyers, legislators and representatives are becoming rather commonplace. "I last visited Moscow in March 1989. This time I came here not only to meet Soviet colleagues, but to take part in a notable event: The Amnesty International's report "When a State Kills. The Death Penalty Against Human Rights", published in the Russian language, was launched in Moscow. The report

gives a clear idea about the acceptance or non-acceptance of the death penalty in various countries.

"It must be acknowledged that existing Soviet legislation substantially narrows the use of this punishment. I wished to contribute to the debate to achieve its complete repeal," Martin said.

Scientific

'Mir' Crew Conducts Routine Experiment

LD1604084890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0600 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Text] The tenth working week is beginning in near-earth orbit for the crew of the space complex Mir. A routine technological experiment is on the agenda today. The cosmonauts will engage in preparation of spectrometric apparatus. Prophylactical works for technical servicing of on-board systems are also planned. According to the reports of the crew, the flight is proceeding normally. Anatoliy Solovyev and Aleksandr Balandin feel well.

'Mir' Cosmonauts Conduct Biotechnology Experiments

LD1704101390 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 17 Apr 90

[Text] Soviet cosmonauts who are in the third month of their mission on board the orbital complex Mir have conducted an experiment in biotechnology. They studied the convergence of cells in conditions of microgravitation. The cosmonauts succeeded in obtaining superclean biologically active substances which can serve as a basis for beginning to produce unique medicines in space. In terrestrial laboratories the development of such substances takes a long time and costs almost a million [currency not specified] in each case. Cosmonauts Anatoliy Solovyev and Aleksandr Balandin have also explored the impact of weightlessness on human cardiovascular system. These experiments aim to devise new diagnosing methods.

Space Program Accomplishments, Failures Reviewed

LD1504111890

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1310 GMT on 12 April carries a 60-minute "Special Cosmonautics Day" edition of the "Man, Earth, Universe" program, presented by Vitaliy Sevastyanov. Sevastyanov, in a communications session recorded at Flight Control Center on 4 April, participates in a hookup with orbiting cosmonauts Balandin and Solovyev, who describe their memories and impressions of Gagarin, the first cosmonaut. The cosmonauts are shown taking a spectrographic readout of a point on earth using (?Gemma) equipment. A viewer has asked for a reading of the atmosphere of Nizhniy-Tagil to be taken, but for technical reasons this is said to be impossible. Writer Yaroslav Golovanov then gives biographical sketches of rocket designer Korolev and his assistants and colleagues.

Academician Barmin describes Soviet efforts in the moon race of the 1960's and the disappointment over the fact that Khrushchev failed to come up with the necessary funding, thus allowing the Americans to get there first. Old mock-ups and models of proposed lunar stations and moon accommodations are shown from projects that were ultimately deemed too expensive to realize in this century. Experiments in which men spent up to 12 months in sealed chambers on earth, using regenerated air and water, are described.

A film, stated in a caption to have been shot by the USSR Ministry of Defense film studios, then shows Baykonyr in Kazakhstan, which "in the middle of the century" was picked for the realization of "mankind's audacious dream." The launch complex and measuring complex are located "tens of kilometers" from each other. "Hundreds of kilometers" of pipes and cables have been laid, and the huge facility is linked by rail and road. The cosmodrome's "birthday" was 2 June 1955. When the first rockets were being launched to Kamchatka, people were already "dreaming of the stars" and the builders called the town "Zvezdograd." "In the summer, it is 45 degrees in the shade, and the burning wind carries a sand as fine as dust. But in recent years, confirming the fears of scientists, the wind increasingly brings with it a bitter, salty dust from the Aral Sea, which is drying up. This did not use to happen." The commentary describes the memory of triumphs, as well as "bitter and difficult days for Baykonyr and the whole country, when the usual seeing-off ceremonies into a space that already seemed homely and close were not followed by joyful welcomes." "Veterans remember rockets burning up during tests, and test workers failing to return from their daily work." This passage is accompanied by black-and-white footage of an intense fire at what appears to be a launch site. Figures can be seen running toward the camera and away from the conflagration. The figures are on fire. The number of rockets prepared for launch at Baykonyr numbered "thousands," the commentary says. The video shows archive film of early years at Baykonyr; trains in the desert; camels looking at a launch site; people exercising, celebrating; more modern shots of rockets going up and shots of the launch site, including a Buran in a hangar.

'Ethical Problems' of Mixed Space Crews

LD1304095590 Moscow TASS in English 0847 GMT 13 Apr 90

[By TASS correspondent Rena Kuznetsova]

[Text] Moscow April 13 TASS—Although the Soviet Union was the first nation to launch a woman into outer space, the Soviet space programme in the past few years has included flights by only all-men crews.

After the flights of Valentina Tereshkova in 1963 and two flights by Svetlana Savitskaya in 1982 and 1984, no Soviet woman has set foot in space.

At the same time, the United States space programme regularly involves flights by mixed crews.

Aleksandr Aleksandrov, head of the Soviet Civil Cosmonauts' Training Programme, explains the absence of women in Soviet space crews by referring to the demanding nature of space expeditions' programmes. Above all, this refers to work during space walks, he told TASS.

"This is unbelievably hard work even for men," says Aleksandrov, who himself participated in two space flights.

"Practically every expedition now involves space walks. Aleksandr Viktorenko and Aleksandr Serebrov walked into space five times during their expedition to the Mir orbital station, spending a total of 17 hours 36 minutes there," he said.

Aleksandrov does not rule out the participation of women experts in short-term expeditions, as is practised by the United States. But, he said, the long-term stay of men and women in orbit "brings about moral and ethical problems."

He said specialists discussed the possibility of launching a husband and wife into space, but failed to find a couple.

Military

Akhromeyev Attacks OGONEK; Defends Forces

PM1004160990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Apr 90 First Edition pp 2, 4

["Second Open Letter to V.A. Korotich, Chief Editor of the Magazine OGONEK" by Marshal of the Soviet Union S. Akhromeyev, CPSU member since 1948: "Attacks on the USSR Armed Forces. Why?"; first three paragraphs are Akhromeyev letter to KRASNAYA ZVEZDA]

[Text] "March 28, 1990—To Lieutenant General I.M. Panov, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Editorial Office:

"OGONEK has refused to publish the second open letter which I wrote to V.A. Korotich, the magazine's chief editor. In this connection I ask you to publish my letter to OGONEK in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA. I ask this because the letter is not of private but public significance and is aimed at defending our Armed Forces against OGONEK's unsubstantiated attacks.

"[Signed] Marshal of the Soviet Union S. Akhromeyev."

Esteemed Vitaliy Alekseyevich!

I ask you to publish my second open letter in the magazine OGONEK. There are several reasons for this.

In my first letter I asked you to meet with me and discuss problems of the Army and Navy in any form: in a private talk, in an interview in the magazine's pages, on television, or in debates in any other auditoriums. We had an agreement to meet on television 23 February this year. The State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting (the "Vzglyad" program) organized such a meeting. However, it did not take place. It certainly was not my fault that this happened.

Comrades who share my opinion on the building of our Armed Forces, which I expounded in the first letter, as well as myself personally, were counting on an open discussion in OGONEK's pages. But this did not happen either. You ensured a solid advantage for yourself: You published four long readers' letters (No. 1 and No. 5 for 1990) and a number of shorter letters and big articles critical of my views on problems of the country's defense capability. At the same time you published just one letter from Gen. V.I. Medvedev, who basically agrees with my position (No. 9). I was not even invited to the "round-table" organized by the magazine (No. 9) on the question "What Kind of Army We Need." And yet I am your opponent on this problem.

The magazine's editorial office receives letters in support of my position. I know about this—the writers send me copies of them. Why has not one of these letters been published? You are evidently avoiding an open, free discussion.

This does not appear very correct from the viewpoint of journalistic ethics. It is certainly necessary to defend one's opinion on equal terms. Advantage must not be taken of the fact that you edit the magazine, while I am just a reader of it. As far as I know, the editorial board is not yet the owner of OGONEK. It belongs to Soviet society. So I am forced once again to express my conviction that your magazine could publish not only material which accords with the views of the editorial board but also material which reflects the views and opinions of various sections of the public which differ from yours.

I was beset with doubts—if this is how my discussion with you turns out, is it worth developing it further under such unequal conditions? OGONEK disseminates its opinion in millions of copies every week, while my possibilities cannot be compared with yours. In addition, we hold too different (sometimes opposite) positions on the chief problems both of the Army and the Navy and of the development of our society as a whole. But, on considering over and over again the complex situation which has taken shape in the country, I became convinced that a discussion is necessary. Our dispute is not of a personal but a fundamental nature.

In the polemic that has developed between us over the present and the future of our Armed Forces (this can be seen from the responses to it) definite and considerable sections of the public stand behind you and behind me. What every Soviet person needs more than ever today, in addition to principledness and the conviction that he is

right, is tolerance and attention toward the opinion and the life stance of another—his comrade at work, his opponent in a debate, his colleague in the party, or even his neighbor in the apartment block. What you and also I must certainly do under these conditions is not set an example of pugnacity and intransigence but display the intention and the desire for gradual understanding of each other, which is so necessary in our society today. As for myself, I intend in the future to seek a constructive basis for a debate with the magazine.

I do not intend to repeat yet again what kind of Armed Forces our country needs. This was not examined in the first letter published in OGONEK (No. 50 for 1989) [sentence as published]. Far from all the questions raised in the letter have been discussed yet. The magazine's opinion on the danger of war for the Soviet Union has not been expounded. In the reply "From the Editors" in the same issue of the magazine and in other 1990 articles on these questions OGONEK gives no reply. Nevertheless, I think that we will still make a joint examination of them. Today I wish to dwell only on some new questions raised by the magazine with regard to problems of the Army and the Navy over the past two or three months.

I.

In issue No. 5 of the magazine for 1990 you said that OGONEK found itself at the forefront of the discussion of military questions. In that same issue of the magazine, examining the Army's role and place in society, you raise the question directly—"The Army for the country, or the country for the Army?" I am convinced that the question has been posed incorrectly. By formulating it this way, the Army is set against the people. What is correct is not such a question but the assertion: the Army for the country, and the country for the Army!

The country's Army and Navy protect and defend the state and their people. The USSR Armed Forces have been ensuring peace for our people through their selfless service for 45 postwar years. True, in OGONEK's opinion, Soviet military leaders spent 40 years inventing a likely adversary for our country (No. 50 for 1989, "From the Editors"), while there was in fact no such adversary. I categorically disagree with that. The Soviet Union did have a real adversary who surrounded our country with a ring of military bases. No one invented him or does so today. Even in January 1990 U.S. Defense Secretary Cheney again called the Soviet Union the United States' chief adversary for the foreseeable future.

Even today, in peacetime, the Army and Navy do not just engage in combat training and maintain themselves in readiness to fulfill their military duty. They fulfill combat tasks. For 24 hours a day throughout the year generals, admirals, and officers keep combat watch in command posts, safeguarding peace and tranquillity, including that of OGONEK's editorial board. Crews of strategic missile submarines perform underwater combat service for two-three months without seeing the light of day; combat crews of the Strategic Missile Forces perform combat duty around the clock for weeks on end; strategic bomber crews are in readiness at airfields to scramble to fulfill tasks. Servicemen of the Air Defense Forces, tactical aircraft pilots, seamen, and our glorious border guard brothers perform constant combat service. I must tell you that this is very difficult and even frequently life-threatening service up to the limit of their mental and physical strength. We can show you it and tell you about it.

Internal troop servicemen along with paratroopers and units of the Ground Forces and the Air Force are today shouldering the heavy burden of ensuring order in regions where interethnic dissension has flared up and blood has been shed. Servicemen are involved in eliminating these conflicts by decision of the supreme organs of power of the USSR and the union republics. Conflicts lead to casualties and, unfortunately, both civilians and servicemen die in these conflicts.

In addition, the Army is its people's loyal helper. In 1989 approximately 80,000 servicemen began building asphalt and concrete roads in the Non-Chernozem Zone and in the north of our country, thus simultaneously equipping [obustraivaya] themselves. For this more than 20 large road construction units were deployed. By the end of 1995 they will have built more than 22,000 km of such roads in Arkhangelsk, Kirov, Vologda, Gorkiy, Kostroma, Perm, Ryazan, Orel, and Sverdlovsk Oblasts and the Udmurt Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. In 1989 they built just 600 km, and in 1990 800 km will be built. But in 1991 and subsequent years more than 3,000 km will be built annually.

Every year tens of thousands of military vehicles work on gathering the harvest. In 1989 75,530 servicemen and 37,000 vehicles worked on gathering the harvest. They transported 26.3 million tonnes of agricultural freight. On their 100 military state farms the Army and the Navy grew approximately 300,000 tonnes of grain, raised livestock, and procured 114,000 tonnes of meat, 66,000 tonnes of milk, and 230 million eggs in 1989. You frequently write condescendingly about all this, claiming that this is not a matter for the Armed Forces. But in vain. Such are the conditions of life in the country today. There are USSR Government decisions relating to all this. They were adopted in mid-1988 with regard to road construction. There is no one else to carry out this work in the country today, and we do not have a food surplus either.

During 1989 military construction workers built approximately 70,000 apartments for officers and ensigns and carried out capital construction for the national economy to the tune of approximately 1 billion rubles. Without them, who would carry out this construction today?

All Soviet people know that in a disaster the Armed Forces are the first to come to the people's aid. This was

the case in Chernobyl, after the earthquake in Armenia, and always in any other situation.

Servicemen also bear a big grudge against you for the way OGONEK reacts to military selflessness. Why is there not a good word showing the complexity and the heroism of military labor?

Yes, it is true that there are many shortcomings among the troops and in the Navy. There are specific, very chronic shortcomings. There are ones that pain our society. For the Armed Forces are a part of it. But is OGONEK really afraid to say something good about the Army? For, whatever you may say, in the course of combat service, combat training, and the fulfillment of difficult tasks in all parts of our motherland and in difficult military labor, the Army and the Navy educate and temper for the people millions of their young sons. You attempt to prove the opposite or, at least, you maintain that this is being done badly. It is always possible to find such individual and even not uncommon facts. But, on the whole, the Army was, is, and will be a school of courage and tempering. Our people are convinced of this. I am ready to travel with you to the troops, to any military district, or to the Navy and show you this.

When the need arises, the people and the government of the USSR turn again and again to their Armed Forces. And the latter always fulfill their demands and requests unfailingly.

The magazine (No. 5) writes of excessive military spending. We military leaders favor spending that is essential for the country's reliable defense. If, in your opinion, there are excesses in military spending, speak about them specifically. Let us examine them together. We favor a further reduction in the strength of armed forces on a mutual basis with the United States and the NATO bloc. I set forth this problem in detail in the first letter. And for the time being I have nothing to add in reply to the magazine's (No. 5) criticism. Except to say once again that I was right when estimating the strength of the U.S. Armed Forces, and OGONEK was wrong. I wrote about this in detail in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA at the end of December 1989.

But what is done "by the country for the Army"?

Even under our complex conditions the Soviet people and the USSR Government endeavor to do everything that is in any way necessary for the Armed Forces. And the military does not bear any grudge against the people. The Army and the Navy are armed, equipped, shod, clothed, fed, and provided with conditions for combat training. Soviet people respect and love them. It is not the country's fault but its misfortune that in individual republics today the Soviet Army and Navy are called "occupiers," the Law on Compulsory Military Service is violated, and the Army is slandered. Incidentally, what is OGONEK's opinion of all this? It is silent in this regard. Clearly, not at all by chance. And yet the magazine could help the Armed Forces.

This is how things stand with the thesis advanced by OGONEK—"The Army for the country, or the country for the Army?"

The magazine (No. 8) came up with the claim that our "home grown (i.e. Soviet) militarists" groundlessly attack OGONEK, deliberately distorting its position (the discovery of such people is to the credit of OGONEK. No one anywhere has written directly of them before). These "home grown militarists" maliciously portray the magazine's criticism of violations of order and "sicknesses" in the Army and the Navy—criticism that is normal in a socialist society—as attacks on the Armed Forces and as discrediting them and thereby harm the magazine's good name.

It would be possible to agree with this if OGONEK carried, in addition to criticism, articles on the heroism of servicemen in peacetime, on strenuous combat training, on the performance of combat service and selflessness in doing so. But there is none of this. The magazine takes no interest in everyday military labor; it has an interest in sensational (and frequently totally uncorroborated) exposes. For even facts cited in readers' letters must be checked out, particularly when they harm the good name of specific people—which OGONEK does far from always.

When I read of "domestic militarists," I fell to thinking: Who are they, specifically? Unfortunately, you do not name them personally. You and I have a different approach here. I see the great harm that OGONEK does to the combat ability of the Army and the Navy with its frequently erroneous articles, and I speak to you openly of this. It is unpleasant, but it can't be helped—a polemic must be conducted directly and honestly. You see these "home grown militarists" doing something wrong and insulting the magazine, but you do not name them. Let everyone make his own guess, you say. Being your chief opponent in the discussion (letters from other people who disagree with you are carried in the magazine in the form of very rare exceptions), I am obliged to number myself, above all, among such "home grown militarists." Since charges of incompetence, conservatism, and suppression of criticism are most frequently leveled in OGONEK personally against the USSR defense minister, the chief of the Main Political Directorate, and certain deputy defense ministers, logic suggests that, in your opinion, they too can be "our militarists."

But I must declare that it is my conviction that the leaders of the USSR Ministry of Defense are not "home grown militarists." Being members of the CPSU Central Committee, in April 1985 the majority of them came out for perestroyka along with the entire composition of the Central Committee, and to this day they invariably uphold M.S. Gorbachev's political line. More than that. They realize this political line in actual practice, being assistants to the USSR leadership in reducing the USSR Armed Forces, they take an active part in the talks on reducing nuclear and conventional arms, and they advocate the further reduction of armed forces on a bilateral

basis with the United States and the NATO bloc. These military leaders are active formulators of the new defensive military doctrine and organizers of its realization. They, these leaders, conscientiously and selflessly serve the homeland, maintaining the combat readiness of the Army and the Navy at the necessary level under today's complex conditions.

Of course, in practical work the military leaders enter into arguments with the state leadership, championing the interests of the Army and the Navy. But this is a normal phenomenon. The leader of any department entrusted with great work is obliged to do this by virtue of his official position.

I believe that the "home grown militarists" have been created in order to portray the Army as some isolated force standing above the people, with this force supposedly being led by the heartless edict-administrative system and directed against the people. This line can be traced in issues of OGONEK for 1990 (Nos. 2, 7, and 8).

The "Soviet militarists" probably are not named also because there simply are no facts that could confirm the fairytale about them today. There just are no Soviet military leaders who would attempt to have an adverse effect on the shaping of the Soviet Union's foreign policy and military doctrine.

I disagree with your assessment of the Army's role in the events that occurred in Baku and Tbilisi. The impression is created by the magazine's articles that the corresponding military district and army commanders use troops in interethnic conflicts almost independently, on their own initiative. The magazine finds no words to condemn the hooligans, thugs, and bandits who killed peaceful people and organized pogroms and expulsions of the peaceful population from their dwellings in Baku, in other rayons of Azerbaijan, and in Armenia. However, it does find words and corresponding photographs to condemn the internal troops and the Army units which acted to ensure order in accordance with the decisions of the country's and the republic's supreme organs of power. Being a nonprofessional in this, the magazine tries to expose, assess, and criticize the mistakes made in the troops' actions. But it fails to notice who is the first to open fire, who dies first as a result of this, and who, in the final analysis, burns in this fire kindled by separatists. Are the USSR Armed Forces really to blame for the sufferings and torments of millions of Soviet citizens in the Transcaucasus, the Baltic region, Moldavia, and other parts of the country, who have become "migrants" or "Russian-speaking occupiers" and who are subjected to humiliation and discrimination? Are the Army and its leaders really to blame for the fact that they have been forced to act to ensure order where it has been violated by the use of force by separatists? We frequently see now in OGONEK disapproval of the Army's actions when it protects people's safety out of its duty to the people and by decision of the country's leadership.

On examining the events in Tbilisi in April 1989 (No. 2, 1990), the magazine does not examine or analyze any aspects of them apart from the military aspects. What really happened in Tbilisi? Who was responsible for the adopted decisions to suppress the rally? What were the reasons behind that decision? The magazine virtually leaves these chief questions in the shade. One question is at the forefront—who fulfilled the adopted decision? A military man. This means that he is responsible for everything.

Of interest in this connection are the magazine's arguments on the so-called "inner independence" of Colonel Gen. I.N. Rodionov, commander of the Transcaucasus Military District, into whose hands the decision of the leadership of the republic and the union to suppress the rally had been placed. He was entrusted with directing that suppression. The magazine writes that I.N. Rodionov had the right and was even morally obliged not to fulfill the decisions of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau and the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

Esteemed OGONEK Editorial Board! In April 1989 the decisions of party organs, including on military questions, were binding on us all. For military leaders (and not only for them) they were at that time decisions of supreme organs of power, decisions of the leadership and government of the republic and the state. Do not pretend that you do not know this! The Congress of People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet took power into their hands only in May 1989. And any serviceman, including Gen. I.N. Rodionov, had taken an oath to fulfill the decisions and orders of the USSR Government. The nonfulfillment of decisions and orders is unthinkable for a serviceman, still more so for a commander. This was clear to Col. Gen. I.N. Rodionov. But OGONEK needed his so-called "inner independence" in order to strike once again at generals in general and to show their apparently unthinking, blind assiduity and unpredictability and, hence, the danger of their actions. This is the magazine's old policy of portraying generals before the people as persons of a low intellectual standard and unworthy of trust. Let us imagine that under the conditions of democracy and glasnost today any general, on receiving an order to fulfill a task from the USSR Government, begins to cast doubt on this order by virtue of his "inner independence," so to speak. He would at once be relieved of the fulfillment of his duties and maybe even brought to trial. Generals and officers will be in a position to fulfill their duty under any very complex conditions if they are accustomed to acting unquestioningly from an early age. This is what military service has been based on for all time. OGONEK has the right to "inner independence," and every civilian has that right. A military man, still less a general, does not have that right in the fulfillment of his military duties. It is inadmissible for a military person to argue about this when the task has already been set. The people, the Congress of People's Deputies, and the USSR Supreme Soviet are obliged to form the country's responsible

government. It is up to the generals to fulfill the orders of this government. I cannot agree with other views on this question expressed recently.

I would like to address the editorial board: Weigh your responsibility once again and think about the great harm that OGONEK has already done to the USSR Armed Forces by subjecting them to unsubstantiated attacks. I am not convinced that you are doing this deliberately. In the ardor and heat of polemics the magazine frequently goes over the top and not only criticizes real shortcomings that occur in the Army and the Navy but aims blows at the Armed Forces themselves, which are defending the socialist homeland. I would ask you to understand that the moral responsibility for this destructive activity lies as a heavy burden on the editorial board. Today you have acquired the right to level scathing criticism at what was bad in the past and what is negative in the present. But at the same time you also assume tremendous responsibility. For, in the final analysis, we are controlled by the people. Each one of us will have to answer for his activity, including OGONEK's editorial board.

II.

OGONEK's dubious stance in assessing the CPSU's activity can be perceived in the sociopolitical line which it is pursuing today.

OGONEK levels consistent criticism at the CPSU for its past activity. The party and many of its figures must continue to be criticized for the past. This is necessary both in the interests of ascertaining the historical truth and in order to derive lessons for the future. But there was much that was positive in the party's activity in the past too. For the CPSU has made a real contribution to the progress of our country and of all mankind. You cannot fail to know this: the adherence to socialist ideals, the struggle to realize them, the achievements in the sphere of social justice which have had a tremendous influence on the whole world, the turning of our country into a great world power. This is all to the CPSU's credit.

But particular concern is aroused by the fact that the magazine avoids analyzing the present, including the substance of the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th party congress "Toward Humane, Democratic Socialism" and other CPSU documents. The four issues (Nos. 7, 8, 9, and 10) published since 13 February (the day the platform was published) have not contained a single line on this draft document. For some reason the magazine hardly comments on the fundamental questions facing our society and the party on the eve of the 28th CPSU Congress—and yet this magazine's publisher is the CPSU Central Committee's "PRAVDA" Publishing House, and it bears the motto "Proletarians of all countries, unite!" It has a print run of 4.5 million copies. The magazine has the full and, I would say, very rare possibility of conveying to its readers the editorial board's attitude toward the draft platform, voicing agreement or disagreement with it, and organizing debates on it. But for some reason this is not done.

It carries reminiscences by figures from the past, serialized detective novels and stories, materials on Stalin's crimes, and much besides. But this is not the chief thing today. Today the magazine must reveal (it is up to the editorial board to decide how to do this) ways out of the political complications, the economic crisis, and the exacerbated interethnic relations. What does the magazine propose on this plane? In practice, very little. Why does the magazine not develop its position on fundamental problems of the life of the Soviet people? Maybe it is awkward to openly disagree with CPSU policy and at the same time publish a magazine under a socialist motto? I believe that this is one of the reasons for the vague stand which the magazine takes on burning questions of interest to our society.

I categorically disagree with another regular line pursued by OGONEK year after year.

In issue after issue the magazine compromises entire generations of Soviet people, but primarily those who entered upon independent life in the thirties. They are portrayed as adherents of Stalinism, in photographs from the thirties holding slogans demanding the execution of so-called "enemies of the people." Surely there are other photographs which show that generation as something different? Why are there none in the magazine's pages? OGONEK's materials show my coevals (I belong to that generation) as dim-witted, submissive, and gray, following Stalin, suspicious and mistrustful of the whole world. In this way the magazine undeservedly insults millions of Soviet people. The magazine fails to examine thoughtfully, truthfully, and I would say scrupulously the thirties, which were full of internal contradictions and tragic elements. Yes, they were years of our society's deformation, of the deaths of innocent people, of Stalin's crimes, of our people's tremendous and totally unwarranted physical sacrifices and moral traumas. There is no forgiveness for villainy. But, at the same time, the thirties were years of a surge of creative labor, of the socialist education of the young generation, and of the creation of the firm foundations of our national economy and the country's defense capability. It is necessary to investigate how both things arose at that time. In what does the dialectic of the unity and the struggle of opposites consist here? Where were the origins of our great victory in the war, if everything was so hopelessly bad before it started? The magazine does not wish to make an analysis of the peculiar nature of that epoch. And yet this is your duty before our Soviet society. We, the readers, not only request but also demand of you such an analysis.

I frequently think: Why does the magazine misrepresent today the inner essence and the biography of millions of people, of those who were between 17 and 25 years old in the thirties? For they themselves and their relatives were frequently victims of the repression of those years and then went off to war to defend the homeland. Today they are already well over 60 and even 70 years old. They saved the world from the fascist plague. I believe, however, that the point is that the majority of these people

are even today consistent defenders of socialism. No, they are not among those who defend their own material advantages, privileges, and, finally, official post. As a rule, they do not have any of this. They have a pension of between R70 and R150-200, and the majority of them live not even modestly, often in apartments that are not well appointed, frequently experiencing great privations. But these people believed and continue to believe in a better socialist future. They have their own convictions and ideals achieved through suffering and defended in labor and in fighting. This generation cannot be deceived or misled. It knows from its own experience what path we have traveled, what our achievement is, and where we have made mistakes. It knows who really favors democratic and humane socialism and who, taking refuge in ringing phrases, is departing from the socialist path. And the impression is formed that OGONEK is not going the same way as such people today. Of course, some of these people frequently are conservative-minded and do not understand and accept all that is happening in the country today. Do they really become our enemies because of this? They must be helped to understand the situation. This too is one of OGONEK's duties to our society.

Life is making us ponder increasingly frequently on the extent to which the 20th century has been unimaginably tragic for Russia and the Soviet Union.

During the first 25 years Russia had to endure three wars (the Russo-Japanese War, World War I, and the civil war), three revolutions (1905 and February and October 1917), and the famine of 1921-1922. Tens of millions of people died in them, and hundreds of thousands of scientists and cultural figures and the majority of the Russian officer corps emigrated from the country. Society was shaken to its core, while the state was destroyed and created anew. It is impossible and probably pointless to seek those who were to blame for this. But the people had to pay for everything.

The second 25-year period was no less terrible. There was the expropriation of the kulaks, the famine of 1931-1932, the repressions of 1937-1938, and the Great Patriotic War. Once again very great upheavals, the tragedy of the people, the deaths of tens of millions of their sons and daughters.

From 1950 through 1985 we lived through the death agony of the Stalinist regime, the frequently ill-considered and costly experiments of N.S. Khrushchev, and the inglorious years of the Brezhnev regime.

I am not one of those who blacken their country and the CPSU and who engage in fault-finding. Alongside the tragedies there were the joy of creation and of the realization of socialist ideals, the years of strenuous labor, 1945—the year of the great victory—the launch into space, the ensuring of the country's reliable defense, and much besides. But let us confess honestly to ourselves and the people: There were more tragedies and casualties.

For five years now our society has been living and acting during the years of perestroyka, which are so essential to us all. It associates its better future with them. But these years too have been difficult and uneasy. And the people are having to pay today for our mistakes. We must never forget this.

Is it not time for us all—particularly those in whom the people put their trust and who shape public opinion in the country in one way or another—to finally become more responsible, to work not toward a split but in the name of unity of action, and to strive for greater concord in building our better democratic and humane future? History teaches us that this is the only correct way for us all to serve our people.

[Signed] Marshal of the Soviet Union S. Akhromeyev, CPSU member since 1948.

Baltic Republics

Vilnius Radio Carries 17 Apr Council Session

Landsbergis Addresses Council

LD1704091290

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0700 GMT on 17 April begins to carry a live relay of the Supreme Council session in Vilnius, chaired by Deputy Kazimieras Motieka.

At 0702 GMT proposals are made for this week's agenda and are adopted.

At 0711 GMT Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis makes a statement on the political situation in Lithuania. He says that a draft reply to Gorbachev has been distributed to the deputies and that it will be debated after his speech.

At 0802 GMT Landsbergis ends his statement, and the debates begin.

At 0803 GMT an unidentified deputy says that a way should be found to resolve relations betweeen Lithuania and the Soviet Union so that the Soviet Union does not lose its dignity and the feeling of being a great power. In his opinion, negotiations should begin, taking as the starting point the treaty between Lithuania and the Soviet Union of 10 October 1939. According to that treaty the Lithuanian capital of Vilnius, illegally occupied by Poland, was returned to Lithuania and Soviet military bases were established on Lithuania's territory.

Reply to Gorbachev Debated

LD1704110790

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0900 GMT on 17 April resumes its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius following a 30-minute interval. Deputy Egidijus Bickauskas, who was absent when the deputies were taking the oath of allegiance, takes his oath.

At 0905 GMT debates on the reply to Gorbachev continue.

At 0910 GMT Deputy Gudaitis says that the aim of Moscow's ultimatum is to intimidate Lithuania's people and other peoples who are striving for independence. Lithuania's actions in Moscow should become more assertive. It is essential to assure Moscow that its strategic aims in Lithuania will not suffer. Firm guarantees should be given to people of other nationalities in Lithuania about their safe conduct in Lithuania.

At 0918 GMT Deputy Tomasevicius, who represents a constituency mainly populated by Poles, expresses his concern about the state of affairs in agriculture and stresses that his electors demand that negotiations with Moscow begin as soon as possible. There is disappointment among the electorate about the inactivity in developing the eastern part of Lithuania and about the inadequate representation of the non-Lithuanian-speaking population on television and radio.

At 0925 GMT Deputy Plekaitis stresses that his voters understand that the act on Lithuania's independence is irrevocable. Being surrounded by a single superpower, Lithuania must do nothing to disturb the balance of the military situation in the Baltic region.

At 0933 GMT Deputy Varanauskas criticizes the Supreme Council for inactivity in making various decisions.

At 0937 GMT Deputy Zalys asks that the reply to Gorbachev be delivered by someone personally. The reply should assure the Soviet Union that there is no opposition in Lithuania to the stationing of Soviet troops. The Soviet Union should also have free access to the port of Klaipeda.

At 0948 GMT Deputy Cepaitis emphasizes that Lithuania cannot return to the situation prior to 11 March 1990.

At 0950 GMT Deputy Rasimavicius insists that a referendum is not necessary; it would be useful only to the enemies of Lithuania. He says he does not believe that presidential rule could be introduce in Lithuania.

At 0955 GMT Deputy Beriozovas describes Lithuania's vulnerable situation in its dispute with Moscow. However, Lithuania's case is just. Presidential rule would return Lithuania and also the whole Soviet Union to Stalinist times. From now on a more real, dynamic and assertive policy should be started toward the Soviet Union. A compromise must be found, especially as regards military service by Lithuania's young men.

At 1011 GMT Deputy Malkevicius says that if there is an economic blockade, the Soviet Union cannot stop the delivery of oil and gas because Lithuania supplies electricity to Belorussia, Latvia, and other parts of the Soviet Union and that the Soviet Union would suffer from the blockade too. Economic sanctions can be answered with similar sanctions against the initiator of sanctions. The Lithuanian countryside can feed all of Lithuania and the country will not starve.

At 1017 GMT Deputy Bickauskas stresses that the most important thing now is for Moscow to sit together with Lithuania at the negotiating table. The Supreme Council should adopt not a letter to Gorbachev, but a statement that would temporarily suspend the implementation of the 11 March act in order to start negotiations.

At 1022 GMT Deputy Pirozhkov, speaking in Russian, criticizes the 11 March act, which has substantially reduced all possibilities for Lithuania's independence, and stresses the decline of Lithuania's economy, citing various figures. This decline will continue if a blockade is introduced. All laws in Lithuania contradicting the

Soviet Constitution should be suspended for the time being. A referendum should be held. It should strengthen Lithuania's position.

At 1035 GMT the session adjourns for 15 minutes, until 1050 GMT.

Deputies Continue Debate

LD1704130690

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1054 GMT on 17 April resumes its live relay of the Supreme Council session in Vilnius. Deputy Bronius Kuzmickas says that at present Lithuania is experiencing a transitional period. It is independent, adopts various laws but is not always able to implement them. Lithuania should not be the cause of worsening relations between the USSR and the United States. The source of our political recognition is Moscow; the West is going to watch how relations between Lithuania and the USSR develop.

At 1003 GMT Deputy Vagnorius complains that Lithuania's economy is being irregularly supplied with raw materials and other products by the Soviet Union. However, we wish to trade with the Soviet Union. Lithuania should continue to fulfill its obligations with enterprises in the Soviet Union and should only fail to honor its pledges if an economic blockade is applied. In his opinion Lithuania's own currency should be introduced as soon as possible. In relations with the West, the cheap Lithuanian labor force should be used.

At 1111 GMT a message from the Soviet Union about the curtailment of gas supplies to Lithuania is read.

At 1114 GMT Deputy Jursenas criticizes the Supreme Council for its hasty decisions, which are sometimes misunderstood in the West. In his opinion more meetings with the non-Lithuanian-speaking electors should be held.

At 1124 GMT Deputy Motieka criticizes some expressions in Gorbachev's warning or ultimatum. He insists that a reply to Gorbachev should not contain remarks which could create confrontation. The introduction of presidential rule in Lithuania would mean Soviet aggression against Lithuania.

At 1135 GMT a deputy whose name is indistinct talks about agricultural problems, especially land distribution among farmers. He also expresses his anxiety about the fate of Lithuania's youth drafted to serve in the Soviet Army.

At 1143 GMT Deputy Vilkas criticizes Landsbergis for his statements.

At 1148 GMT Deputy Antanavicius recommends that all proposals be taken into consideration and be discussed because differences of opinion are always useful. The Supreme Council should represent the opinions of all people.

At 1201 GMT a deputy whose name is indistinct appeals to all deputies not to start any disputes and quarrels. Only the unity of all Lithuanians can be effective in this dispute with Moscow. He urges the Supreme Council to speed up the solution of various problems affecting the occupation of various buildings, the recruitment of workers to the militia, and so forth. He wants to introduce some amendments to the reply to Gorbachev.

At 1216 GMT questions are put to the previous speaker.

At 1218 GMT Deputy Uoka states that the aim of Gorbachev's and Ryzhkov's message is to drive a wedge into Lithuanian society, but the workers are united and Moscow will not succeed in sowing discord among the workers. All channels to maintain relations with Moscow should be used.

At 1223 GMT Deputy Nedzinskiene expresses her concern about the fate of Lithuanian young people serving in the Soviet Armed Forces.

At 1225 GMT Deputy Ziemelis proposes to introduce an amendment to the reply.

At 1228 GMT a deputy whose name is indistinct supports the amendment.

At 1232 GMT there are proposals about the final preparation of the reply. The session chairman announces that the council commissions will meet at 1500 GMT to discuss the draft reply to Moscow.

Gas Company Receives Notice of Supply Reduction

LD1704114590 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1111 GMT 17 Apr 90

[Telegram in Russian read by Aleksandras Abisalas, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session, in Vilnius—live]

[Text] Vilnius, to Vistinis, general director of Lithuanian Gas, implementing the orders dated 16 April 1990 of the USSR Government and those of the State Gas Concern No. 81D —I want to draw your attention to the date— [preceding phrase in Lithuanian] supplies of natural gas to the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic will be sharply reduced beginning 17 April of this year.
Signed by Mochernyuk, acting general director of Western Gas Area.

Landsbergis, Prunskiene Cited on Economic Sanctions

PM1604223190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 17 Apr 90 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Lithuania: Eve of Session"]

[Text] Vilnius, 16 Apr—V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, held a news conference here today. The head of the Lithuanian parliament answered questions connected with the republic's economic potential in the event of an "economic blockade of Lithuania by the USSR."

Landsbergis described the main condition set by the USSR leadership—that the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers repeal the decisions made by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet to restore an independent Lithuanian state—and a number of others as "impracticable" ["nevypolnimyy"].

The Lithuanian government, Landsbergis stressed, has instructed the republic's enterprises to continue fulfilling their commitments to their partners in the USSR.

He noted that no obstacles will be put in the way of Lithuanian young men who want to serve in the Soviet Army.

In a telegram sent to M.S. Gorbachev and N.I. Ryzhkov, Prime Minister K. Prunskiene stated that the Lithuanian government "for its part sees no reasons which would justify a deterioration in economic mutual relations. Yet we do not understand the specific content of the economic sanctions outlined, and we would not want to provide a false interpretation of them to our people and to the world."

Prunskiene, Purtulis Discuss Moscow's 'Ultimatum'

LD1604155990 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1300 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Interview with Kazimiera Prunskiene, Lithuanian prime minister, and Rimantas Purtulis, by correspondent Dora Petkauskaite in Vilnius—live]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] A sitting was held by the government of Lithuania at 0700 GMT this morning and at 0800 GMT a joint conference of members of the government and the Supreme Council Presidium began.

The latest Moscow ultimatum was discussed.

Correspondent Dora Petkauskaite spoke to participants of the conference after it concluded.

[D. Petkauskaite] Journalists are gathering around Romualdas Ozolas, Kazimiera Prunskiene, and Algirdas Brazauskas, and here is one participant of the conference who is free at the moment, and he is Rimantas Purtulis. Could you tell us what your latest post is?

[R. Purtulis] Well, the title is very long: general director of the Department of International Economic Links of the Council of Ministers. [passage omitted] We hope that we will manage to find out what specifically will be done with our republic. This letter does not give any specific details. However, measures can be most diverse. In any case, measures which could be applied to Lithuania automatically turn against the Soviet Union without taking any sanctions on our side because there is substantial integration of common issues.

Therefore, we decided that whatever happens, until we see definite physical measures against Lithuanian industry and economy, all contractual obligations to the USSR must be continued to be carried out by all our enterprises, so that there is no excuse for a possible disruption in supplies by the Soviet Union. [passage omitted] Many colonies have become seperated—Algeria, India, and others—however, on the contrary, the rulers of these colonies have always tried to maintain economic links in order to avoid inflicting harm on themselves. We hope that this is more of a political game than one of serious economic consequences.

[D. Petkauskaite] While we were talking to esteemed R. Purtulis, Prime Minister K. Prunskiene finished her last interview to "Panorama". I would like to hear at least an oral account of the specific answers to criticisms we heard and read in M. Gorbachev and Ryzhkov's letter.

[Prunskiene] There are three specific criticisms besides the main criticism which has always been stressed, i.e. our illegal actions. By the way, this time no criticism was made concerning the documents adopted on 11 March. And the three specific criticisms first of all are: our actions in connection with the spring recruitment [to the Soviet Armed Forces] and impediments made to it; then alleged discrimination of citizen's rights which is caused by the introduction of the citizen's ID cards—this is given a very peculiar intepretation; and the third is our claims, according to their understanding, on CPSU property.

We did not give a very specific answer to each of these criticisms. We speak more in terms of proposals saying that these questions as well as the issue of armed forces and defense in general—including the recruitment of young men who can join the army on a voluntary basis, and we would not interfere—could be negotiated and this should be done during negotiations.

We drew their attention concerning the rights of citizens. We do not see any discrimination here. All this preserves the social rights of those people, who for their own motives, which they understand, or because of their personal attitude, do not want to become citizens of Lithuania and will remain citizens of the USSR. We also drew their attention to the fact that the Lithuanian Communist Party property is an integral part of national property. Naturally this issue becomes a part of mutual claims or a part of the entire object of negotiations.

We expressed a certain wish in this letter that the USSR should label the penalties in a specific way, i.e. discontinuing the supply of goods and naming the kinds of goods which are sold for hard currency and which would not be supplied to Lithuania. There are many points that are not yet clear—what kind of goods and what does the possibility of selling them for convertible currency really mean? Perhaps there would by no buyers who would buy it for convertible currency this year, or some other time. Or does this mean that we also will have to pay in hard currency? Or will these goods not be sold to us, even if we pay in hard currency? Or does this mean that goods which are controlled by the central organs in Moscow will not be sold? Or will bringing in goods which had

been bought or obtained in exchange for our goods be banned altogether? There is much that has not been specified. Therefore, we drew Moscow's attention to the fact that we do not want to give extensive comments on this for our people and the world before us have made clear what Moscow has in mind.

At the end of the response we expressed our hope once again that all these issues should be, and we propose this, that these questions should be resolved benevolently and on the basis of mutual benefit.

[Petkauskaite] I heard that the final version of the text of the letter will be written today jointly with other members of the government. Will this letter be sent without waiting for the Supreme Soviet session?

[Prunskiene] We decided at the joint conference of the government and the Presidium that, bearing in mind that the telegram is addressed to two institutions, i.e. the Supreme Council and the Council of Ministers, and that the draft response I proposed was discussed at the sitting of the Council of Ministers—some places were changed and corrected in the letter—and then this draft was discussed at the Presidium and their opinion was heard on it. Following all these we all arrived at a conclusion that there would be two answers, one from each addressee of the telegram.

The Council of Ministers speaks about very specific issues because an economic blocade mainly concerns the activities of the Council of Ministers. Therefore they will give an answer within the framework of their competence, and the Supreme Council will probably give an answer of a more political nature. The session will not start until tomorrow. Therefore, the Supreme Soviet will not give an answer before tomorrow.

Prunskiene Notes Blockade 'Countermeasures'

LD1604181290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Video report by correspondent Aleksandr Barkhatov from Vilnius on Lithuanian Council of Ministers' 16 April session, including interview with K. Prunskiene, chairman of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers; video shows Barkhatov interviewing Prunskiene with Brazauskas in attendance—recorded; introductory paragraph read by announcer; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] If you recall, Lithuania is due to adopt decisions important for itself and us. This is what our correspondent Aleksandr Barkhatov has just reported from Vilnius.

[Barkhatov] People have a day off today in Lithuania; the Easter holidays are continuing. Nevertheless, the republican Council of Ministers gathered at an extraordinary session devoted to discussing the familiar appeal of the USSR president and the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers to the republic's Supreme Council and the Council of Ministers.

[Prunskiene] We see the appeal we have prepared to the Government of the Soviet Union and to the president on such questions as an opportunity to reach an agreement and a need to reach an agreement. We are requesting an elucidation of what constitutes an economic blockade, what it in fact specifically means, because if suddenly one side adopts certain sanctions then at least... [Prunskiene changes thought] Clearly, world practice suggests that these measures be specified, otherwise this is a cold and very bitter war, a war against the people of Lithuania—which incidentally includes people who are, who consider themselves to be, citizens of the Soviet Union itself.

[Barkhatov] So, as I understand it, we are talking about countermeasures which may be taken by the republic?

[Prunskiene] As far as we are concerned—and it may seem strange to you—these are countermeasures of a reverse kind. That is, we have decided to work out a decision addressed to our enterprises so that they, on their own initiative, do not respond by stopping supplies to the Soviet Union. We believe that for our part we wish to fulfill [our obligations] in a very correct way, even at a cost to us, to our own detriment, despite the incomplete supplies that exist at the moment. We have no wish to be transgressors of contractural obligations, of contractual relations, and by our sense of discipline and our desire to act correctly we wish to influence the other side and not create a pretext for such actions.

[Barkhatov] In the second part of the day, at a joint working session of representatives of the presidium of the republican Supreme Council and Council of Ministers, the results of the ministers' morning conference were heard. A decision was adopted to send two replies to Moscow separately: One today on behalf of the republican government, and the second under the signature of the Lithuanian Supreme Council at the conclusion of its debate at the session, which will renew its work tomorrow.

[Announcer] In connection with the situation that has been created in Lithuania, Prunskiene, the republican prime minister, believes that under these circumstances, I quote, we see no way for a possible solution to the question other than the immediate acceptance in Moscow of a delegation of the Lithuanian government, headed by its chairman. It would seem natural that before finding ourselves in complicated conditions we should be able to obtain more specific explanations. We have not lost hope for bilateral goodwill and common sense in our future relations.

This information, as on previous occasions, has just been sent by telephone by our correspondent. We have acquainted you more than once in our programs with the most diverse points of view on the situation that has developed in Lithuania. This was the opinion of republican Prime Minister Prunskiene.

Prunskiene Sends Telegram to Gorbachev

LD1604210590 Moscow TASS in English 2040 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Text] Vilnius April 16 TASS—The Presidium of the Lithuania Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers, at their meetings today, discussed the April 13 message from Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov to the leadership and people of Lithuania.

The message warned in particular that if the Lithuanian leadership within two days does not rescind a number of legislative acts and decisions which it adopted recently and which counterpose Lithuania to the other republics and the Soviet Union as a whole, instructions would be issued to stop the supply of those types of goods, which are sold on the external market for freely convertible currency, to Lithuania from the other union republics.

Kazimiera Prunskiene, Lithuanian prime minister, in an interview broadcast by the central television network tonight, stated that she saw the possibility and the need to come to terms.

A telegram which Prunskiene sent to Gorbachev and Ryzhkov says that the Lithuanian government "does not see reasons to justify a worsening of economic relations. We do not understand the content of the economic sanctions alluded to and would not like to give false explanations to our people and to the world."

The Lithuanian prime minister said that a decision was taken to elaborate a resolution addressed to Lithuanian enterprises so that they would not respond by stopping deliveries to the Soviet Union.

A news conference of Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, was held here today. He answered questions connected with the economic possibilities of the republic in the event of the "establishment of an economic blockade of Lithuania by the USSR."

Landsbergis described as "impracticable" the main condition, set by the Soviet leadership to the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers about the abrogation of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet decision on the restoration of the independent Lithuanian state, and a number of other decisions.

The Lithuanian government, Landsbergis emphasised, made it incumbent upon the republic's enterprises to continue to fulfill obligations to its partners in the USSR.

He pointed out that there would be no hindrances for Lithuanian young people who wish to serve in the Soviet Army.

Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Discusses 'Draft Reply'

LD1604152190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Text] [Announcer] Evidently, not all listeners have had a chance to listen from the very beginning to our program, which began at 1600. Therefore, I will provide a review of the events of the first half of the day. I would like to open it with a report of Elena Kurkletite from Lithuania. Here she is. [Kurkletite] Today the two-day deadline is up for the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet and the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers to adopt decisions regarding the message of Mikhail Gorbachev, the USSR president, and Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, which says that if during the two days the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the Lithuanian SSR fail to repeal their decisions, instructions will be given to stop the supplies to the Lithuanian SSR from other Union republics of the types of goods which are realized on the foreign market in freely convertible currency. Many people in Lithuania have perceived this message as an ultimatum threatening with an economic blockade.

The members of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Presidium are conducting a preliminary discussion of a draft reply. Tomorrow after the Easter celebrations, the session of the republic's Supreme Soviet will continue proceedings, and evidently the deputies will draw up a final reply to the message of Mikhail Gorbachev and Nikolay Ryzhkov.

A communique has been adopted on the meeting held by the government heads of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia on questions concerning economic cooperation. It says that the government heads of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia have signed an agreement on economic cooperation, including a gradual creation of a Baltic market. The sides involved in the agreement believe that the comprehensive and qualitative development of commodity, monetary, and market relations constitute the strategic direction of actions to be taken both in internal, mutual, and foreign economic relations.

Impact of Moscow Embargo; Contacts Sought

PM1604174590 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 17 Apr 90 p 3

[Own correspondent R. Motskus report under "Stop Press!" rubric: "So Where Is the Way Out of the Crisis"]

[Text] Vilnius—Despite the two days off over Easter, huge lines are forming at gas stations in Lithuania. This is, so to speak, the initial gut reaction to the warnings from Moscow: Unless the Supreme Soviet repeals within two days its decisions of 11 March, deliveries to Lithuania from other Union republics of products which can be sold on the external market for freely convertible currency will be halted.

Speaking on television, R. Ozolas, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers, announced that ministers and other senior officials will study all the possible options of this embargo on Monday and Tuesday. Products received from the USSR which could be sold for foreign currency include oil, gas, metal, chemical products, cotton, and timber. If "the taps are turned off" many enterprises would be able to continue their economic operations for only about two weeks. There are sufficient gasoline stocks to last one month. True enough, fuel stocks will make it possible to complete the spring sowing. Domestic gas will disappear within 20 days, and the situation with electricity supplies is similar.

The Lithuanian leadership's official reply will become known only after this issue of the newspaper has been published. One thing is clear, however—it is necessary to seek ways out of the crisis situation. In this context I would like to inform readers of the results of a trip to Moscow by a group of individuals from Lithuanian women's societies. They were received at the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Ministry of Defense's General Staff, visited the Committees of Soviet Women and Soldiers' Mothers and the Lenin Children's Foundation, and took part in meetings with the Moscow public.

This is what Noele Ozhelite, deputy of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, had to say:

"For as long as government offices in Moscow avoid contacts with our republic's official representatives, it is necessary to seek links through informal organizations and cultural and scientific personalities. Such links are not binding on either side, but they could help in finding formulas which could subsequently be discussed by officials. While in Moscow we were received by A. Girenko, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who deals with matters of nationality relations. He is a flexible and diplomatic person. We spoke of how to suspend the action of laws already adopted so as to ease relations in situations of the greatest conflict and to map out ways to compromise solutions. I realize that our 'diplomacy' may displease certain people, but it is necessary to seek common points of contact."

There is another event which cannot be overlooked. An agreement on a Baltic market has been signed by Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in Vilnius. It provides for mutual assistance in extreme situations, as well as a division of labor and specialization among the three republics. Similar attempts were also made several decades ago, but each time they came to nothing.

Ozolas Reports Lithuania Could Resist Blockade

AU1604134290 Paris AFP in English 1319 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, April 16 (AFP)—Lithuania could hold out for a month if Moscow imposed a total economic blockade, according to the republic's deputy premier, Romualdas Ozolas, who appealed to residents not to go panic buying. Speaking on local television, Mr. Ozolas said Lithuania had enough oil and coal reserves for a month and gas and electricity for 20 days.

However, long lines had formed at petrol stations in Vilnius Monday, local residents said, and people were stocking up on various goods, from petrol (gasoline) to candles, INTERFAX, a Moscow Radio publication reported.

Meanwhile, a joint meeting of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers and the parliament's Presidium took place Monday to discuss a response to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's threat of economic sanctions if the republic failed to repeal laws linked to its secessionist stand, local officials said.

No details were immediately released following the emergency meeting, but Vilnius Radio said the government had discussed a plan of economic measures should Moscow go ahead with a blockade.

Mr. Gorbachev and Soviet Prime Minister Nikolai Ryzhkov on Friday warned of economic sanctions, possibly involving oil and gas supplies, if the rebel republic failed to repeal a series of new laws within two days.

Blockade Effects on Lithuania Discussed

LD1604125790 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Vitaliy Gurov commentary—read by announcer]

[Text] The two days have expired which President Gorbachev and Prime Minister Ryzhkov gave to the leadership of Lithuania to revoke the illegal, unconstitutional decisions of parliament and government of that sovereign republic. The message from the two Soviet leaders said other republics will stop supplies of those goods that are realized on the foreign market for hard currency. Of course, one can evaluate in different ways the important and responsiible move of the Soviet leadership, writes our commentator, Vitaliy Gurov. Some people already view the move as an ultimatum. The chairman of Lithuania's parliament, Vytautas Landsbergis, has called the message an impossible demand. Other people regard the appeal as the only proper and fair move.

Before drawing any conclusions, I would first like to make a reminder that in the past month, or just a little longer, Lithuania's parliament passed almost 80 laws and other acts that to varying degrees run counter to the Soviet Constitution. On 11 March Lithuania proclaimed itself an independent state. A number of bills passed since then provide for discriminatory measures toward the citizens who would like to live in keeping with the Constitution and laws of the whole of the USSR. Some other sovereign republics believe it is legal to keep up supplies of goods to Lithuania while its leaders simply ignore the lawful interests of the entire Soviet economy.

The move taken in this situation seems quite natural. Either live by the laws fixed for the whole country or stop using the benefits and possibilities granted by the integrated economy.

What is the reaction to the warning in Lithuania? In an interview for Soviet television, the deputy chairman of Lithuania's parliament, Kazimieras Motieka, said he can see nothing extraordinary in this situation. We'll be looking for other ways to receive raw materials and other products that we need, he said. A Lithuanian deputy prime minister, Romualdas Ozolas, noted that in case of an economic blockade the republic's industry will be able to function only for two weeks. The sanctions by the center and by other sovereign republics can bring about a decline in production and consequently massive layoffs of personnel at those industrial facilities that use imported raw materials. Large processing facilities are involved where the bulk of the workers are from the Russian-speaking population.

The Lithuanian government is considering the situation today and the republic's parliament expects to tackle it tomorrow. I wouldn't like to make any forecasts for the short-term future, and the answer to the question: "What next?", is not clear to anyone, I think. Events are not moving to a written script. One only wishes that reason and goodwill should prevail along with the ability to make compromises and attempts at taking steps one toward the other, but not in the opposite directions.

Lithuania's Brazauskas, Stankevicius Interviewed

LD1604143890

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian at 1200 GMT on 16 April broadcasts an interview with Algirdas Brazauskas, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers; and Ceslovas Stankeviciuis, deputy chairman of the Supreme Council Presidium by Eduard Kasabutskiy, immediately after the meeting of the Lithuanian Supreme Council Presidium.

Brazauskas is interviewed first. He reports that: "This meeting continued for just under three hours without a break." The meeting was, he says, held in "a spirit of search for a way out of the situation, if I may put it that way. To start with, reports were made to the Supreme Council Presidium by us and several members of the government on possible changes in the normal rhythm of work of the republic's economy. Of course, the lack of specific information makes it harder to make any decisions. The statement by the president and the chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR just sets out general principles. It speaks of possible breaks in economic ties—but what sort of breaks?"

There are, he says, several approaches that could be taken to this: cutting off electricity supplies, gas supplies, and supplies of goods and raw materials.

Asked what decision the presidium had reached, Brazauskas says: "So far we have not reached any decision, because, first and foremost, political decisions should be made and those will be made tomorrow by the Supreme Council. For our part, as the government, we are examining the various options and the possible difficulties that might arise, and are hunting for ways of tackling these."

He refuses to be drawn any further: "At the moment I am not prepared to draw any conclusions, because this has been only the first official discussion of this matter. I believe the main discussion will take place tomorrow at the session of the Supreme Council, and the conclusions will be drawn then."

In conclusion, he is asked by Kasabutskiy: "You have often met the top leaders of the USSR. What do you think their personal emotion's are? Have they any basic sympathy for Lithuania?"

Brazauskas replies: "In great politics personal emotions do not, or in my opinion at any rate should not, play any special part. Personal emotions do not come into it. Politics is politics and diplomacy is diplomacy. Personal feelings run second to these."

Ceslovas Stankevicius is interviewed next. He claims that: "I believe what we have been discussing is indeed a political problem and not an economic one. For the Soviet Union wants to achieve political results through the economic sanctions it has outlined. And so our position as set out by the government and the Supreme Council is that we are ready to resolve all the specific problems that arise in the relations between the Soviet Union and the republic of Lithuania by means of talks, without any preconditions. This even includes those specific problems that are raised in the statement by the Government of the Soviet Union. That is, issues relating to USSR citizens in Lithuania. These and other matters can be discussed. We are ready for such discussions and are confident that they will take place. All these issues can be resolved to our mutual satisfaction."

After a long question by the correspondent about the fear of discrimination against non-Lithuanians in Lithuania, Stankevicius gives assurance that Lithuania adheres to international law, and the Lithuanian Constitution (Article 17) guarantees certain rights to citizens from other states. "Of course, in any state full rights are only enjoyed by the citizens of that state, but social rights will not and are not being infringed."

The final question is: "What will you feel when you enter the hall where the deputies of Lithuania's Supreme Council are assembled to discuss this important question?"

Stankevicius replies: "In these days over Easter I have had the opportunity to visit Kaunas, meet many people and get a feeling of their mood. In my opinion, the mood of many people in Lithuania is calm. They believe all the problems between the Soviet Union and Lithuania should be resolved by intellect and not by [word indistinct] and that there is no reason to panic. And so, we

will discuss this in a workmanlike fashion—I have already spoken of this. Businesslike discussion usually yields concrete results when the sides sit down together and sift through the details and specifics of a problem. We hope this will be the case. It is difficult to say today what form this will take, but all the problems should be tackled and sorted out around the negotiating table."

TASS Cites U.S. Analyst on Lithuania

LD1704115990 Moscow TASS in English 1027 GMT 17 Apr 90

[Text] New York April 17 TASS—By TASS correspondent Andrey Sitov: Paradoxically, unequivocal support is the hardest blow the United states can deal Lithuania, according to Jim Fain, a political analyst of the United States Cox Information Service.

By openly encouraging Lithuanians, the United States could repeat its 1956 mistake, when leading republicans made anti-communism their major political weapon, he writes.

The then Vice-President Richard Nixon and Secretary of State John Foster were in the front ranks of the crusade. Mccarthyism blossomed. Radio station Free Europe transmitted calls for an uprising.

And when Hungarians and some East Germans heard the call, the United States left them in the lurch.

In reality, Lithuania can only count on greater autonomy and slow movement towards independence on terms that should be negotiated settling the current crisis.

European problems cannot be settled in isolation. Many are frightened by the prospect of German reunification, he said. The settlement of this problem can give hope to the baltic republics.

Fain said it was necessary to consider Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze's proposal on a simultaneous German membership in NATO and the Warsaw Treaty.

He praised United States President George Bush's handling of events in Lithuania.

Bush made it clear that the United States supports self-determination. The United States cannot impose its will on other peoples without being prepared to use force. Politicians and pundits who applauded the U.S. invasion in Panama are now taking irreconcilable positions towards Eastern Europe. These are mostly people who do not fight in our country's wars, he writes.

The Cox publishing group includes about two dozen major newspapers in southern United States and has a correspondents' network in the United States and abroad.

Checkpoint Official Views Border Security

PM1604155790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Apr 90 First Edition p 4

[Interview with Lieutenant Colonel V. Ogorodnikov, chief of Baltic Border District's "Vilnius" special checkpoint, by special correspondents Captain 2d Rank V. Gromak and Captain 3d Rank V. Urban at the "Vilnius" checkpoint; no date of interview given, under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Lithuania: 'Visa No. VT-0001' And So On"; first paragraph is an introduction]

[Text] The Baltic Border District's "Vilnius" special checkpoint implements the border regime at the city airport and the Lazdijaj-Ogrodniki highway junction. It was there that we interviewed Lieutenant Colonel V. Ogorodnikov, chief of the special checkpoint.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Vitaliy Ivanovich, the first question is rather general: What have the border guards done to implement the well known presidential decree?

[Ogorodnikov] They immediately stepped up border security. There are problems. For example, the Lazdijaj checkpoint on our side of the border with Poland lacks technical and other services for the handling of Soviet and Polish citizens, even though it was set up at the Lithuanian authorities' request. Hence the kilometers-long lines of cars. Naturally, tempers get frayed.

Of course, trucks cross the border as they did before. There is no question about economic ties. People traveling to Poland on official business do not experience any delays, either. Restrictions apply only to those traveling privately.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] What was the response to the decision by the republic's new government to set up its own economic checkpoints?

[Ogorodnikov] This is worrying, I can tell you as much. And something else. We have information that some students' groupings were getting ready to demolish engineering installations along the border. The number of border guards at the special checkpoint was increased so as to prevent undesirable consequences.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] And so, the situation is complex. It seems to us that it is further aggravated by the republic's mass media. Therefore, could we ask you to comment the report carried by the newspaper VECHERNIYE NOVOSTI under the headline "Visa No. VT-0001." Let us briefly refresh your memory. Edward Luts [as published], correspondent of the British newspaper THE INDEPENDENT, arrived in Vilnius from Berlin without a Soviet visa. This created difficulties, and the newspaper created a stir about it.

[Ogorodnikov] We will remember this British citizen for a long time to come. The elementary probity of border guards, and faith in the probity of people representing Lithuania's present government, played their role here. The republic's Foreign Minister Saudargas and a group

of persons accompanying him arrived before the aircraft from Berlin had landed. The minister declared that it was bringing in someone whom they were meeting. He demanded an opportunity to see the citizen before the border control formalities. We were unable to grant his request, but we did make it possible for them to meet in the deputies' lounge.

This is what transpired during the border control formalities. Apart from his passport, the British citizen had no other documents entitling him to cross the border, no basic visa in other words. The minister, who was watching the border guard detail at work, asked Major Valeriy Demidenko: What was the reason for the delay? The officer explained that there was no visa. "Can I have a look?", the minister asked and took the passport. He immediately handed it over to one of his officials who stamped it with a visa. And validated it with the seal of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Foreign Ministry.

We immediately reported this to Moscow. The answer followed: "There is no flight back, we are talking about human beings, let us make an exception and allow the correspondent to enter the republic." And this is what happened. I was very surprised when this entire incident was given a completely different interpretation in the local press.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Vitaliy Ivanovich, this is a natural question: Is this an isolated case?

[Ogorodnikov] No. The incident with the British citizen occurred at the end of March; five others were found on 3 April, while a scheduled flight from Warsaw was being processed. Three Frenchmen, an Englishman, and a Danish citizen who arrived in the republic at the invitation of that selfsame foreign minister. Three of them had visas issued by the nonexistent Lithuanian Republic, the other two had no visas at all. Of course, the foreign minister tried to meet them. However, bearing in mind the current Union legislation, the decree currently in force, and the fact that the first case resulted in border guards becoming pawns in a political game, we sent them back out of the Union via Grodno.

I can also cite other examples...

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] There has been a lot of talk about it being possible to buy gas pistols and aerosol cans in Lithuania. How do they get here?

[Ogorodnikov] Along different channels. We have had numerous occasions to confiscate such articles, and in large quantities at that. Mainly from Polish citizens.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] What measures are applied against offending foreign citizens?

[Ogorodnikov] Virtually none. Confiscation, then the citizen is cautioned and allowed to cross the border. We inform the Polish side of all such cases. But I must say bluntly that such things are freely on sale in Poland.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] In conclusion, let us turn back to the visa situation. Life carries on. Business contacts with abroad cannot be halted. How can a foreigner enter Lithuania?

[Ogorodnikov] Vilnius Airport is open to all foreigners who have obtained valid visas from our consular institutions abroad for legitimate purposes.

Report on Work of Lithuanian Draft Offices

PM1604231790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Apr 90 First Edition pp 1,3

[Own correspondent Captain Second Rank V. Gromak telephoned report under "Direct Line" rubric: "Lithuania: Military Commissariats Outside the Law"]

[Text] Vilnius, 16 Apr—In the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] the draft of young people for service in the USSR Armed Forces has begun on the basis of the USSR "Law on Universal Military Service." It has begun under difficult conditions. A few days ago it became known that it was planned to turn off water and power supplies to Kaunas City's Panemunskiy Rayon Military Commissariat in the very near future. This was the decision of the local ispolkom [executive committee]. A similar fate awaits another 27 rayon and city military commissariats which have received notification to that effect from the local authorities.

However, this is just one aspect of the boycott of the draft into the Armed Forces. Colonel I. Gliznutse, military commissar in Shyaulyay City, regularly receives threatening letters and telephone calls. In some areas people have moved from threats to out-and-out violence. Thus, in Panevezhis a group of young people beat up Senior Warrant Officer Vaytkyavichus, a worker at the city military commissariat, and smashed his vehicle. The senior warrant officer's children are being taunted, and people have phoned his apartment making threats against his wife.

"These are not isolated cases," I was told by Colonel K. Golubev, chief of the republic military commissariat's political department. "And they are being carried out by young 'patriots' egged on by Lithuanian parliamentarians..."

Draftees should pass a medical board. But here too the authorities are erecting all kinds of obstacles. Appearing on republic television 12 April 1990 the health minister called on young men to reject service and to destroy their draft papers. They were also told that participation by medical personnel in draft commissions' work would be deemed as contempt [ignorirovaniye] for the decisions of the republic's Supreme Soviet and as absenteeism punishable by subsequent dismissal from their permanent employment.

"We have doctors who have been working on medical commissions for 10-15 years," Col. Golubev continued. "Now they're scared..."

The republic's military commissariat workers are making every effort to carry out the spring draft in organized fashion. They are receiving practical assistance locally from a group of Baltic Military District officers headed by Colonel E. Nikolenko. The officers have already visited Shyaulyay, Panevezhis, Vilnius, and Trakayskiy, Kayshyadorskiy, and Kaunasskiy Rayons.

Here is Col. E. Nikolenko's account:

"We talk with draftees, their parents, and representatives of the authorities locally. The overwhelming majority of guys want to serve. That is their parents' wish too. But people are afraid they'll be classed as enemies of the people. Everyone I spoke to was of the same opinion: We need firm authority. The dyarchy prevailing in practice in the republic is having an adverse effect on draft work."

In Col. Nikolenko's words, the effectiveness of the work is being diminished for the following reason too. The areas visited by the officers from military commissariats and the Baltic Military District Headquarters and directorates have also been visited by "Sajudis" representatives. They are making overt threats and engaging in blackmail.

Sowing is under way in the republic. When mines and shells from the Great Patriotic War were uncovered on a sovkhoz [state farm] in Kayshyadorskiy Rayon its director, P. Aytakolnis, appealed to Military Commissar Major Yu. Balsis for help. At his request military engineers went to sweep the fields. The dangerous finds were disarmed. But when will the actions of those who are driving a wedge between the Army and the republic's inhabitants be disarmed?

Arguments Against Geneva Convention Pleas Cited

PM1704094390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Apr 90 Second Edition p 5

[Reader's letter, reply by Major Yu. Glebov under the "Dialogue" rubric: "From Competent Sources. Attention: Dangerous Speculation"]

[Text] "I have heard that attempts to sidestep the draft in the Baltic republics are being justified with references to the 1949 Geneva Convention, which allegedly authorizes refusal to serve in the Soviet Army as an 'army of occupation.'
"V. Nagornyy, Krasnoyarsk."

Four Geneva conventions to protect war victims were adopted 12 August 1949. One of them, the convention "On the Protection of Civilian Population in Wartime" (I stress, wartime) contains Article 51, which bans occupation powers from forcing the population of an occupied territory to serve in their armed or auxiliary forces; while Article 2 stipulates that the convention will apply "in the event of a declaration of war or any other armed conflict." The provisions of the Geneva conventions and the additional protocols dated 1977 apply to interstate legal relations pertaining exclusively to war or armed conflicts.

Consequently these conventions bear no relation to the legal regulation of the USSR citizens' draft for military service. References to them are nothing but speculation on people's ignorance. A speculation which is all the more dangerous since it may prompt a misguided citizen to violate the law. As for the "army of occupation" label applied to the Soviet Army—legal or any other comment appears superfluous.

[Signed] Major of Justice, Candidate of Juridical Sciences I. Glebov (USSR Ministry of Defense Press Center).

Sobchak Regrets Brazauskas Nonelection

90UN1457A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 7 Apr 90 p 2

[Report on interview with USSR People's Deputy A. Sobchak by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA correspondents S. Kucher and A. Chalyy: "The Fate of a People Cannot Be Swapped for Ministerial Portfolios"; date and place not specified]

[Text] "It was a private visit," Anatoliy Aleksandrovich, said. "I gained the most contradictory impressions. Somewhat unexpected was the fact that many inhabitants of the republic with whom I talked, including Lithuanians, were quite critical of the activity of Landsbergis and the new Lithuanian Supreme Soviet and of the decisions it is adopting. It was heartening that practically everyone I met aspires to a solution of the urgent questions peacefully and legally, for they understand what troubles for the republic and its people possible clashes could entail.

"I would further mention Lithuanians' particular courtesy and attentiveness in respect of newcomers. This was for me a pleasant surprise. Wherever I went, wherever I stopped, I nowhere noticed the hostility and confrontation our press writes about, although concern and fears for the future are felt everywhere."

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] What is the attitude in Lithuania toward the well-known presidential edict?

[Sobchak] A varying attitude, naturally. But generally people understand that it was dictated by the aspiration to prevent an exacerbation of the situation.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] ...and toward the appeal of the republic's leadership to Lithuanians on termination of service in the Soviet Army?

[Sobchak] Virtually everyone I spoke with regarded it negatively. I speak as a lawyer: Such a policy puts a multitude of specific people in jeopardy—the same Lithuanian soldiers, for example. They have taken the oath, and for this reason on leaving the service they become criminals, in accordance with the law. They will

be tried. A serious politician does not have the right to dispose of others' lives! Even one life, particularly under such circumstances. There is no political wisdom here, no real necessity.

All difficult problems should be the subject of negotiations, not settled on the spur of the moment. But the question of the higher school, say, is being decided precisely in that way. As you know, tuition was conducted previously in practically all the republic's VUZ's [higher educational institutions] in Russian as well as Lithuanian. Now they are starting to close down the Russian-speaking groups and departments. Yet such actions could in the future bring about a reverse reaction—Lithuanian students could, say, come to be dismissed from Russian VUZ's. What are we coming to?

In the years that I worked at Leningrad State University dozens of Lithuanians were my students. They now work in Lithuania and, as far as I know, are working well. Why is it now necessary to deprive Lithuanians of the opportunity to obtain an education in Moscow, Leningrad, and other Russian cities and union republics?

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] What do you, as a lawyer, understand by the procedure of a republic's secession from the Union?

[Sobchak] There is a legislative mechanism catering for all the political and economic consequences of such a secession. There is, for example, a mechanism for dissolving a marriage. A marriage that was not even legally registered (but existed in fact) presupposes in accordance with the law certain consequences: distribution of common property, a decision on the fate of the children, and so forth. So in the situation involving Lithuania. When it is a question of a whole people, a union republic that is legally part of the Union, there is a particular need for a very precise, well-conceived mechanism which ensures observance of the interests of all citizens without exception, not only persons of indigenous nationality, and which provides for a concordance of the interests of the republic and the Union. We have just enacted such a law, and it now needs to be applied.

I would invoke also the rules of international law. There have already been similar situations—in Namibia, for example. When it is a question of territorial changes, of the separation of one state from the body of another, a form of plebiscite or referendum is always obligatorily employed. And deciding the issue at a meeting of the republic Supreme Soviet, elected by a minority of the population, what is more, is not in my view the best method.

Taking the path of confrontation is also possible, of course: Lithuania could make claims and immediately unilaterally break off relations. Let us assume that we also do the same—we could, after all, switch off the electric power and end the supply of oil, gas, coal, and a number of most important commodities. The republic would find itself in a most difficult situation.... But this will not happen! All the country's enterprises are continuing to fulfill Lithuania's orders. And the Lithuanian side also must fulfill the contracts it has concluded and the commitments it has assumed. The most important thing today is that neither party lose common sense and bring matters to the point of violent clashes.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] Why was there not a national referendum in Lithuania?

[Sobchak] Most likely because the decision on this issue seemed obvious to "Sajudis" leaders. They believe that a referendum would be a simple formality—the people would support them—and they consider the victory at the elections that have just been held—with a program for the achievement of full political, state independence, given the preservation of economic ties to the Union—to be an expression of nationwide trust. These arguments are not, however, an excuse for the actions that followed in the wake of the elections.

But I am disturbed today by another aspect of the problem. I am worried by the military and the politicians in the center who would very much like to bring matters to the point of conflict to put an end once and for all to the republics' possibility and desire to secede from the Union. This would be the worst possibility, as it would jeopardize the prestige of the new presidential power and the formation of a new political and state system.

I repeat: Negotiations are essential. No economic or political issue can be resolved without them. I believe that Mikhail Sergeyevich was wrong when he said in a fit of temper at the congress that we would negotiate only with foreign states. According to the constitution, each union republic is an independent state formation, and the Union conducts negotiations with it. How otherwise to explain the conclusion of a union treaty? A treaty is concluded by a party that is competent to conclude it. We recall Lenin's well-known definition: What are negotiations? They are the start of a treaty. What is a treaty? It is the end of negotiations.

I am generally on these matters a supporter of quite a strict state policy. Besides secession and the right to self-determination, the law should also provide for the possibility under certain conditions of the expulsion of a republic or other state formation from the Union. This is essential to avert negative political and economic consequences of secession for other members of the Union.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] Is a repetition of the Azerbaijan situation—a state of emergency and the commitment of troops—possible in Lithuania?

[Sobchak] In my opinion this is impermissible and, I would like to believe, impossible. First, Lithuania has entirely different traditions—political, democratic, parliamentary and, what is particularly important, religious (the conflicts in the Transcaucasus are, after all, being stoked by religious confrontation). I hope that it does not come to the point of violence in Lithuania and that the "Lithuania question," like the problems of the other

Baltic republics also, will be tackled democratically.... It seems to me that the Lithuania situation was correctly described by Professor Shmelev: It is a problem of sponsors prepared to pay Lithuania's debts. That is, primarily a problem of the republic's economic relations with the Union.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] How should the August 1940 treaty be evaluated from the viewpoint of international law?

[Sobchak] From the viewpoint of international law everything is ambivalent. No one is questioning the existence of Lithuania's 1,000-year statehood. But if all the legal enactments of 1939-1940 were to be deemed unlawful, Lithuania would have to return to the borders corresponding to the 1921 treaty. And this would mean that Vilnius with its Vilnius Province would have to revert to Poland. For this reason mechanically reiterating the assertion concerning the illegality of such legal instruments is highly dubious. I do not dispute the fact that these instruments were enacted under pressure, say, on the part of the Stalin regime. But, after all, there were in Lithuania also people interested in coming to power, people who acquired power in this way. They also adopted the corresponding declarations in Lithuania's parliament and government. The republic has subsequently lived for 50 years within the Union. Every five years people have elected their deputies, and a republic government has been in operation. No one forced Lithuanians at gunpoint to vote for Snechkus or Paletskis, say. For this reason arguments of the "if there was no marriage, there can be no divorce" type are simply without foundation. From the de facto marriage—good or bad—there have been many children, and many common problems have arisen. Lithuanian politicians need to think about this, in my opinion. Neither the union state, the republic, nor the Lithuanian people should suffer primarily. Practically all states would, in my opinion, be wise not to rush into the establishment of relations with Lithuania until its secession has been formalized legally.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] Does it not seem to you that certain Lithuanian politicians are guided by personal motives?

[Sobchak] Yes, much here is conditioned by personal aspects also. There are also, I believe, many of those who are counting in the future on positions in the government, ministerial office, positions as ambassadors overseas and so forth. Of course, if the people really put their trust in them, so be it! But sacrificing for individual persons the interests of those who would not wish to remain in Lithuania (and there would be many of them, not only among Russian-speaking citizens, as it is now customary to say here, but Lithuanians also) is inhumane, to say the least. Whatever the nationality of the person wishing to leave for the Union following secession, Lithuania should compensate him for his loss of job and apartment, and all this would, naturally, take time.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] What is your attitude toward Brazauskas?

[Sobchak] I am sorry that he lost at the elections. Had the president been elected by the whole population, the majority of votes would, I am sure, have been cast for Brazauskas since his personal rating was higher than that of Landsbergis. Brazauskas is a man with a sober approach to the solution of all questions. He is a realist, not a supporter of extreme ill-considered actions. I am sure, in any event, that he would not be jeopardizing Lithuania's young men serving in the army, as Landsbergis has been in a hurry to do.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] Are you not afraid that your statements will be seen in Lithuania as interference in its internal affairs?

[Sobchak] I hope this will not be the case. I treat with full respect both the idea of Lithuania's independence and many Lithuanian politicians. If my sympathies lie with Brazauskas and Prunskene, this is another matter Politics should ultimately be above grudges and personal affections.

Lithuanian Union Official on Political Situation

90UN1433A Moscow TRUD in Russian 6 Apr 90 p 3

[Report on interview with A. Kayris, cochairman of Interim Coordinating Committee for trade union movement, by TRUD special correspondent A. Petrov: "On the Subject of an Appeal"; date and place not specified]

[Text] Vilnius—The coordinating committee of the Lithuanian trade union movement recently issued an appeal to Soviet trade unions, democratic movements, and citizens of goodwill. The appeal assesses positively the one-sided actions of the republic parliament and contains a call for solidarity and help.

First a few words about the committee itself. In January of this year the republic trade union council plenum prematurely curtailed the powers of the trade union council presidium and secretariat and set up an Interim Coordinating Committee for the trade union movement in Lithuania to replace them. This was made up of representatives from the republic committees of the sector trade unions and a number of primary organizations. It was stipulated that the main task for the committee, acting on a public foundation, would be to make preparations for a congress of the republic's trade unions. But at that time attention was drawn to the fact that representatives of Sajudis were included on the committee which, as is known, is not a trade union organization. At the same time movements supporting other political positions were not represented in that organ.

So now the committee has issued a document that is raising many questions. TRUD special correspondent A.

Petrov interviews A. Kayris—one of the three cochairmen of the coordinating committee who wrote the appeal.

[Petrov] In the appeal you issued it is stated that parliament "has by constitutional means restored the independent Lithuanian republic." What is the constitution to which this refers if the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet has proclaimed the USSR Constitution null and void on republic territory?

[Kayris] The parliament was elected legally. It has passed a resolution concerning secession from the USSR. People support this decision.

[Petrov] The legality of the election of the parliament is one thing. But you will agree that the parliament must observe the country's constitution until the question of the republic's secession is resolved by legal means. It is not legal at a single stroke to "exchange" the Soviet Constitution for a bourgeois constitution.... It is not only the constitutionality of this step that is open to doubt, but also its wisdom. Would it not have been better first to reach agreement and consider in a comprehensive way how to effect secession and how, as the major factor, to live afterward, and then move on to deciding to take such a step...? The more so since the majority of the Russian-speaking population is against secession from the USSR.

[Kayris] Nevertheless I do think that we wrote the right thing. The committee supported precisely this version.

[Petrov] The committee not only accepted the version but even, as it were, "approved" the condition in which the republic finds itself. The working class is being split along national lines and many people simply do not know which laws are in force and which not. People are losing their faith in the future.... Did the Interim Coordinating Committee have a reason for approving a hasty decision on behalf of all trade unions?

[Kayris] We were given full powers, since there is no other trade union organ in Lithuania.

[Petrov] But how does this stand from the position of the thousands of workers in the union enterprises and organizations who do not want to leave the USSR? It may be a minority of the total number of the trade union members, but they do have the right of vote. Otherwise how can we talk about democracy and pluralism in the republic? But you are imparting to the Interim Committee the position of sole and overall committee. There are also some doubts about the references made in the appeal to the legal government of Lithuania. Even though on the day that the appeal was issued the republic Council of Ministers had not even been fully formed....

[Kayris] Perhaps we should say "parliament" instead of government....

[Petrov] The complaint against the USSR government, which is "evading" negotiations, is also incomprehensible. It is not evading them but, as I understand it, only refusing to talk under the threat of ultimatums—this is clear position, I think.... I would ask you to comment on the accusation leveled against the USSR Armed Forces, which, you write, "are striving in every possible way to provoke disorders, and are assaulting administrative buildings and hospitals and seizing people...." A terrible picture is being painted.

[Kayris] What I have in mind is the assaults on psychiatric hospitals and the seizure of young men who were there. The seizure of the Higher Party School, and the premises of the party gorkom and Central Committee....

[Petrov] But you are well aware that the troops did not "seize" unknown "young men"—they were detaining deserters who had left their units and were hiding in a medical establishment....

And no one has assaulted administrative buildings. The republic organs of power were located in them and they still are—the Supreme Soviet, the city executive committee, the courts.... At the request of the Lithuanian Communist Party (based on the CPSU platform) the servicemen have set up entry checkpoints and placed a guarantee on buildings belonging to the party—a public organization that has nothing to do with the organs of power in Lithuania. This was only to stop the buildings from being occupied by outside organizations....

[Kayris] Even so, we had to react to this. And we remained silent for such a long time....

[Petrov] In that case do you not think that you should also have reacted to the position assumed by the parliament, seeing that the Lithuanian trade unions really became independent from power? For it was through your hasty decisions that the parliament incited young people to an ill-considered step. And Supreme Soviet Chairman V. Landsbergis even called on them to hide in the hospital beds and promised them protection....

[Kayris] Our young men do not fit well in a Soviet army. But it would have been better to resolve the problem at the state level....

[Petrov] And a final question. In the appeal you state the following: "Help defend democracy." Against whom?

[Kayris] The decision to secede from the USSR was reached democratically. We are counting on support for it. We want to work calmly and live in a friendly way with everyone....

[Petrov] A fine wish. It seems to me that it would not be a bad thing to realize that wish by starting in the republic—strengthen the friendship of the peoples living here, safeguard their rights, and develop a democracy that assumes a respectful attitude toward the opinion of the minority. I do not doubt that the Soviet trade unions and all citizens of goodwill would help in that work without waiting for appeals and calls.

That was the interview. Now a few generalizations.

The appeal that was talked about is not the only document of its kind adopted by the Interim Coordinating Committee of the Lithuanian trade union movement. It has also issued a statement to organizations abroad in which those same words about force and requests to defend democracy were used. Similar statements have been addressed to the world public by the Lithuanian Union of Physicians and other organizations. It is not difficult to see that almost word for word all these documents contain the premature accusations that were made from the tribune of the republic Supreme Soviet. This is natural: The coordinating committee, the leadership of other public organizations, and the parliament include those same people who support Sajudis and who listen only to their own voices, even though they are not sparing in their use of the words "pluralism" and "democracy...."

No one has any doubts about the right of the Lithuanian people to decide their own fate. But we should obviously not forget that the Poles, Belorussians, Russians, and Jews living in the republic have the same right. In a very complicated sociopolitical situation, what is also needed from the leaders of the Lithuanian trade unions is a well-considered approach to the assessment of events, and they must have their own position—one that is founded on protecting the people of labor regardless of their nationality or political views. Only this kind of position, we suggest, can lead to a lessening in tension in the republic and to the constructive steps that would satisfy equally all strata of the working class and the entire population of Lithuania.

Gosplan Deputy on Lithuanian Independence

904A0299A Moscow TRUD in Russian
10 Apr 90 pp 2-3

[Report on interview with A.N. Troshin, deputy chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, by TRUD correspondent Ye. Varshavskaya; date and place not specified: "Lithuania: Tomorrow's Weather"]

[Text] Political processes that have recently developed in Lithuania are the subject of close attention by the Soviet public. What can the economic consequences be of the legislative acts on "restoring the independent Lithuanian state" adopted by the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet? A TRUD correspondent approached A.N. Troshin, deputy chairman of the State Planning Committee [Gosplan], with a request to assess the situation from his point of view and discuss the possible development of the processes under way.

[Varshavskaya] Aleksandr Nikolayevich, one gets the impression that the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet's decision to secede from the USSR came as a surprise to many people. As you see it, does this not testify to shortcomings at the center, resulting in the development of the current situation?

[Troshin] I would say that not only the decision on the secession of the Lithuanian SSR from the USSR came as surprise, but also the way it was made: without holding an all-peoples' referendum, and before the formation of the supreme organ of state power in the republic was complete. The interests of the union, other republics, and all strata of the population of Lithuania itself were not really taken into account. This is all the more strange if we recall how at the congresses and sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet the people's deputies from the Lithuanian SSR came out in favor of the need to take into account the opinion of all sides and ensure a consensus in the course of resolving complex issues.

As far as "the shortcomings of the center" are concerned, indeed, for many years administrative-command methods prevailed in relations with the union republics; many management functions were unjustifiably concentrated in the center, the rights of the republics were restricted, and the territorial-branch principles of economic management were violated.

The stated policy of "equalizing" the level of development of some republics was very frequently carried out at the expense of the interests of other regions, through nonequivalent exchange and the uneven distribution of capital investment. Certainly, this practice created preferential conditions for some republics, mainly those that did not have raw materials, while compelling others "to share" their incomes and restricting their development. The worst point is that all of this was happening without public scrutiny; data on the redistribution of funds among the territories were not published. Hence the public got the impression that everything that certain regions have at present they have earned exclusively by themselves.

This very opinion has formed in the Lithuanian SSR and is now being supported by the new leadership of the republic. Meanwhile, as far as the level of development of Lithuania in 1940 is concerned, it was well below the all-union one: A lag by a factor of three existed in the level of development of industrial production. Only seven percent of the populace was employed in industry. At present, Lithuania is mainly an industrial republic with highly developed agriculture. Fifty billion rubles have been invested in the economy of Lithuania in order to achieve this!

[Varshavskaya] Indeed, but the Lithuanian government objects, saying that having attained a high level of production and having made a leap in its development, the republic began to participate in the process of "equalization" this time as "a donor," paying its "hard-earned" money for the benefit of other republics, and that, supposedly, Lithuania's debts to the union were repaid during these years.

[Troshin] There are objective notions of the national income distributed and generated. So, when you compare these statistics for the Lithuanian SSR, it turns out that in the last 25 years the national income distributed on the territory of the republic exceeded that generated by R5.4 billion. That is, no matter how much Lithuania

participated in the development of other republics, no matter how much it contributed to the center, it used a considerably greater amount of national income than it produced. This, however, is aggregated accounting based on national income. Let me quote some more specific statistics describing the participation of the union, of all republics in creating the potential of Lithuania.

At present, some new leaders of Lithuania talk about the highly developed agriculture of the republic, about the center having little to do with it, about Lithuania supposedly "feeding Moscow" at its expense, at a loss to itself. At the same time, the facts testify otherwise.

For several decades, the availability of capital investment to the agroindustrial complex of the Lithuanian SSR was several times better than that to other regions of the country. Thus, in the ninth five-year plan the republic was allocated 3.8 times more capital investment for production purposes per hectare of agricultural land than on the average in the USSR, and three times more than in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]. In the 10th five-year plan, it was respectively 3.4 and 2.6 times more, in the 11th it was 3.2 and 2.5 times more, and in 1986 through 1989—3.4 and 2.5 times more. As a result, capital endowment per hectare of arable land in Lithuania is at present 2.6 times higher than in the country as a whole, and 2.8 times higher than in the RSFSR.

Much work was done in the republic in the sphere of land reclamation, social development in the countryside, and road construction, at the expense of the union budget. By as early as 1970, 36 percent of the agricultural land available had been ameliorated there, and at present this share exceeds 70 percent.

Here is another example, say, railway transportation. Representatives of the leadership of Lithuania insist on its nationalization, stating that in the years of Soviet power nothing was done for the development of the railways: In the 1940's, their length on Lithuanian territory was 2,041 kilometers, and at present 2,024 kilometers. However, one important circumstance is passed over in silence in this instance: The railroad has become different. The track has been reconstructed along virtually its entire length; it has been equipped with more powerful engine types, with diesel traction replacing steam, and electric traction coming in on the segments with the highest intensiveness of freight traffic. A second main track and automatic blocking systems have been built on a number of segments of the railroad. Terminals have been reconstructed and developed, and the pool of cars has been renewed.

As a result, the operational potential of the railroad has increased immeasurably. During the last 40 years, the shipping of freight has grown by a factor of 4.8, freight turnover has increased during the same period by a factor of 8.6, and passenger turnover by a factor of 5.3.

In conjunction with this, I would like to stress that they need to make correct calculations rather than get involved in some kind of manipulation and passing it off as an economic justification. The economy calls for precision.

[Varshavskaya] Fine, but let us still depart from the issue of who owes whom. Do the complete economic independence and secession of Lithuania have some foundation, are they possible at present? Or is it a purely political action which does not proceed from economic reality?

[Troshin] As I see it, the new leadership of the republic did not thoroughly think through the economic consequences of this kind of "secession."

It is no accident that in the Lithuanian SSR they are now persistently repeating that the republic is not raising the issue of severing economic relations with the union. After all, this would threaten colossal economic losses for the republic, if not catastrophe. However, in the course of Lithuania's secession from the union the issue of establishing new economic relations in keeping with a new political reality will unavoidably arise. What does that mean? Trade should be conducted in a freely convertible currency and at world market prices, that is, along the same lines that are now being implemented in mutual relations with CEMA countries. For example, oil costs several times less here than on the foreign market. On the contrary, prices for meat, milk, products of light industry—the things Lithuania specializes in—are much higher in the domestic market than they are in the West. Therefore, if trade were to be expressed in terms of world prices, our state could receive for its oil considerably more products and of considerably better quality than it receives at present from Lithuania at prices in effect within the USSR.

The Lithuanian leadership hopes that deliveries to the republic will be maintained, as well as the prices in effect at the 1989-1990 level, which would be advantageous for Lithuania. However, this is unrealistic and naive!

It does not make sense for the union and union republics to trade with another independent state on terms that are disadvantageous for them. Why sell that same ton of oil for R30 when it costs $110 to $120 in the world market (one cubic meter of gas R26 and $62 respectively, and a ton of diesel fuel R68 and $130 respectively)?

As I see it, other consequences of secession were not thought through either. For example the issue of labor, which will arise unavoidably as soon as Lithuania becomes an independent state. At present, more than 300,000 people live in the republic who are not fluent in the Lithuanian language. These are mainly skilled specialists who have come from other regions of the country in order to accomplish republic and all-union tasks. It may be expected that many of them will not remain on the territory of another country and will not want to lose USSR citizenship. This is a tremendous social problem, but also an economic one. The loss of such specialists will be deeply felt by the economy of the republic. Who will ensure the operation of many enterprises of the leading branches of industry in their place?

[Varshavskaya] Aleksandr Nikolayevich, why was this decision made after all if, judging by what you are saying, the secession of Lithuania from the USSR is fraught with such hard-to-solve problems for its population, and the economy of the republic will suffer from it? This was not only due to the economic short-sightedness of the government of Lithuania, was it? Do you see some other reasons for it which are, perhaps, hidden from the view of a "layman?"

[Troshin] I think that the aspiration to strengthen the current Lithuanian leadership's hold on power is the main reason for the actions which it has undertaken unilaterally and which contravene the USSR Constitution. The economic consequences of the decisions concern it little at this point. Facts from our very recent history, which are somehow forgotten due to the recent stormy events, testify to this. As I see it, these facts explain a lot.

In November of last year the USSR Supreme Soviet passed a law on the economic independence of the three Baltic republics. On 7 February of this year a resolution "On Priority Measures for Implementing the USSR Law 'On the Economic Independence of the Lithuanian SSR, Latvian SSR, and Estonian SSR in 1990'" was passed. Please note—it is very important: The resolution was adopted jointly by the USSR Council of Ministers and the governments of these three republics for the first time.

The adoption of the law and subsequently the resolution proceeded with difficulties, controversy, and mutual claims. It was unusual for many people: independence for the three republics, but what about the remaining 12? Nonetheless the law was adopted, and its implementation would have done a lot for Lithuania, for the genuine economic independence of the republic. From as soon as this year the republic would have managed its industrial potential (somewhere around 60 to 70 percent of all production). More than 100 of the largest enterprises belonging to the USSR are located in Lithuania. Pursuant to the law, about 30 enterprises were to be transferred to the jurisdiction of the Lithuanian SSR this year, and in the future the process of their transfer would be continued.

The center will cease to dictate all conditions, redistribute funds, and set delivery plans by arbitrary methods after the republics' transition to self-financing and the establishment of direct contacts and contracts. Contracts which precisely specify mutual obligations should be signed by the republics and central organs.

It would appear that this is the solution to the problems that Lithuania has been striving for. However, it turned out that this does not satisfy the leaders of Sajudis, it is simply of no interest to them, all the more so because the transition to economic independence is fraught with many consequences which are "not lucrative" for Lithuania. After all, the "equalization" of economic relations between the republics will occur to a considerable degree "to the detriment" of the Lithuanian SSR, which will have to exist in a harsher environment of economic accountability....

I think that the perception of this also prompted the current leaders of Lithuania to take their hasty steps and make the decision to secede from the Soviet Union.

The fact that the possible economic consequences of this decision were not thoroughly thought through also confirms this assumption. At present, they talk a lot about the "economic romanticism" and "economic naivete" of proclaiming Lithuanian independence. I would like to repeat that this is not the main point. Purely political calculations are at work here. Individual statements by the Sajudis leaders are known on the need to restore not only the independence of Lithuania, but also the system which existed in Lithuania before 1940, while maintaining existing contacts with the Soviet Union, as well as the prices at which Lithuania engages in commerce within our state. To this end the illusion of "a goodwill gesture" of sorts is created: So, we are seceding from here, but we want everything to remain the same in the economy, trade, and supplies. If the USSR government does not agree to these conditions—and I have already said that accepting these conditions would not make sense—there will be an uproar about a blockade of the republic by the state, and a blockade due to political motives at that. Therefore, an attempt is being made to ensure preferences and privileges in the economy through a political game.

[Varshavskaya] We have been talking a lot and very persistently about the consequences of Lithuania's secession for the republic itself, so persistently that this is beginning to raise a suspicion: Could it be that the USSR itself is afraid, could it be that the secession of the Lithuanian SSR will be a blow it cannot withstand?

[Troshin] I would not be objective if I said that Lithuania's secession will not have serious economic consequences for the USSR.

A number of unique enterprises reporting to the union, enterprises that are monopoly producers of some types of output, have been built in the Lithuanian SSR. Reduced, or worse yet entirely discontinued, deliveries from these enterprises may affect the production of output that is extremely important for our country. We may also be deprived of some of the volume of foodstuffs deliveries. There are defense installations, a large sea port, main railway lines and highways, airports, pipelines, power lines, and means of communication on the territory of the republic. For example, the Ignalina Nuclear Power Station meets 20 percent of the needs of Belorussia and 80 percent of the needs of Kaliningrad Oblast for electricity. The fate of these enterprises will not be decided overnight and unilaterally.

Still, we should say that Lithuania, which depends on other union republics for 90 to 95 percent of the deliveries of many of the most important types of products,

will suffer incomparably greater economic losses. The data on in-shipment and out-shipment in the balance of intersectoral flows testify to this. However, we should be more concerned about something else—the people, their fate, issues associated with the change of citizenship, place of residence, and many other similar issues. The new leaders of Lithuania are actually avoiding all of these issues, which are in reality among the most acute. This is confirmed by a large stream of letters coming from the republic. Thousands and tens of thousands of resettled persons—this could be the result of such "improvidence" for our country. Housing will have to be built and new jobs will have to be created. Besides, how can the moral losses of the people whose rights are going to be violated be calculated? This is to say nothing about possible internal aggravations.

[Varshavskaya] Indeed, the situation is extremely serious. Aleksandr Nikolayevich, do you see any way to solve the existing problem?

[Troshin] Seceding from the USSR should not and cannot be a momentary and unilateral act. It is possible only as a result of a period of transition in the course of which new mutual contacts will be determined and established, and issues of both social and economic nature will be resolved. It seems to me that the highly significant decisions on the secession of a republic from the USSR should only be made by way of a referendum because, after all, the people, and their rights and interests should be the focus of our attention.

In view of this, the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet should display a balanced approach to solving the existing problem, repeal its unconstitutional decisions, and ensure the holding of a referendum on a democratic basis.

However, even if the population of the republic comes out in favor of seceding from the Soviet Union, this can only be done in keeping with the law on procedures for such a secession which has been adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet....

Anti-Army Instances Noted in Lithuania

PM1504175990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Apr 90 First Edition p 6

[Special correspondent Captain Second Rank V. Gromak report under the rubric "Direct Line": "Lithuania: Swastika and Passions"]

[Text] Vilnius, 13 Apr—Lithuania's separatist forces are fueling anti-Army sentiments with every passing day.

During the past few days alone the republic Supreme Soviet has adopted several documents calling for a boycott of service in the USSR Armed Forces. These are the grounds: "...The parliament of Lithuania... believes that by refusing to serve in the army of a foreign state you will strengthen Lithuania's independence."

How do young Lithuanians perceive such appeals? The city's students and young people held a kind of demonstration 12 April, which developed into a thousands-strong rally in the square in front of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet building. It was held on the initiative of students of Vilnius Pedagogic Institute. V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, participated in the rally. The nature of the rally is indicated most expressively by the slogans which the young people brought with them—"Red Army out of Lithuania!" "Occupiers go home!" "USSR—empire of evil"—and by posters on which the red star is featured next to a fascist swastika. Alas, the matter is not confined to verbal attacks on servicemen. Extremist sallies involving the use of force are becoming increasingly frequent not only in Vilnius but also in other cities of the republic.

The chief of Vilnius Garrison notified the chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet in writing of instances of illegal actions against servicemen by the local populace. In the end they were admitted officially. Albeit in a very peculiar way. K. Motieka, deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet, declared at a 10 April news conference at the republic Supreme Soviet: "...A report has been received from Telshyay that the door of an apartment was set on fire in a block where families of Russian officers live. In Klaipeda a citizen lost control of his vehicle, mounted the sidewalk, and brushed against a soldier..."

The fact that threats against soldiers are increasingly being heard in Lithuania and that the authorities are stepping up pressure on them and members of their families was also discussed at a party conference of communists of Vilnius Garrison. The conference delegates adopted an appeal to USSR President M.S. Gorbachev.

As I write these lines, I can hear beneath the hotel windows the roaring of a crowd which has filled the central street of the Lithuanian capital.

Servicemen Attacked in Lithuania; Shots Fired

PM0504145790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Apr 90 First Edition p 4

[USSR Defense Ministry Press Center report: "Provocateurs"]

[Text] In Lithuania a report has been published on the creation of a ministry of "national defense." Registration of volunteers to join its formations continues and inspections of the detachments of fighters [boyeviki] are being organized. At the same time the financing of military commissariats out of local budget funds ceased as of 1 April, as did the payment of salaries to the local soviets' military records personnel. Self-defense detachments are also being formed in Latvia and Estonia. Funds to set them up are being collected openly. Active work is being carried out to establish contacts with people's front organizations in other republics. The

appearance of representatives of the Azerbaijan People's Front to discuss questions of joint action with local Sajudis organs is noted.

Acts of provocation against servicemen, including guard personnel, show no signs of abating. On the night of 28-29 March a group of intoxicated civilians drove up in four cars to a guarded depot in Varena (Lithuania). Another group of youths approached the installation at the same time. Some of them climbed trees near the guarded installation, verbally abused the servicemen, threatened them with physical violence, and threw rocks at the guard. Four shots were fired from one of the vehicles. A number of hooligans were detained.

At the same time quite a few examples are known where local inhabitants are, despite the media's anti-army campaign, expressing gratitude and thanks to our servicemen. In Klaipeda, for example, an elderly man, Lithuanian by nationality (whose name we withhold for understandable reasons), said to a group of sailors: "What, then, are we to do about the 50 years lived under Soviet rule?" He then burst into tears and shook the sailors' hands. Another Lithuanian said to a patrol: "Lads, if it is in your power, act to prevent them separating us."

The Lithuanian Ministry of Communications order disconnecting the system of notification of military commissariats and civil defense headquarters is bound to cause a protest. This is yet another link in the chain of irresponsible and unlawful decisions damaging not only to servicemen but to the population of the republic too.

Separatist and nationalist elements are intensifying their efforts to stymie the spring draft. Unfortunately, a number of deputies have also gotten involved in this unscrupulous campaign of provocation. For example, at one rally in Riga Latvian Supreme Soviet Deputy E. Repshe gave young people detailed instructions on draft dodging At the same time the extremist youth organization Cross of Fire has launched work among young men of draft age to recruit them into their organization.

Anti-army actions aimed at stymieing the draft are also being carried out in Estonia. Leaders of city and rayon organs of power often take part in them, forgetting their responsibility to the people and the fact that their provocative actions are encouraging young people to break the law.

Lithuanian Anti-Independence Rally, Appeal

90UN1298D Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Mar 90 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed article: "Appeal Adopted"]

[Text] A meeting of the citizens of the capital of Lithuania and the Vilnius region took place in Vilnius on 18 March. There were 180,000 people at the meeting. An appeal to Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, president of the USSR, and members of the USSR Supreme Soviet was adopted at the meeting.

It says in the document:

We appeal to you in these days that are so difficult and bitter for us, on behalf of those who are near and dear to us and of all the citizens of the Soviet Union.

The leaders of "Sajudis" who were approved in the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet on 10-12 March 1990 have virtually carried out an unconstitutional revolt. They have broken off relations with the Soviet Union—with our united multiethnic homeland. They are hastily passing illegal legislative acts that are dismantling the Soviet system and dooming the workers to unjustified deprivation and torment in the name of satisfying the egotistical ambitions of antisocialist forces. They are also arrogantly and hypocritically ignoring the interests of many thousands of citizens who are categorically opposed to being torn away from the peoples of the USSR and are convinced of the correctness of the socialist choice.

Over the decades we, people of various nationalities, have lived on the land of Lithuania and labored for the good of its peoples and the peoples of all our country. We have given and are prepared to continue giving our knowledge and strength to the cause of creating a humane democratic socialism, and to continue striving for the prosperity of a sovereign Soviet Lithuania within a renewed federation of equal Soviet peoples.

Supporting without reserve the right of each nation to self-determination even to the point of state secession, we express our firm conviction that a mechanism for the practical implementation of succession must be created that will guarantee complete protection of the legal interests of even the smallest nationality and of all the national groups.

For this reason we wholly support the decree of the special Third USSR Congress of People's Deputies on the decisions of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet of 10-12 March, and we express hope and confidence that you, comrade president, and you, comrade members of the USSR Supreme Soviet, will guarantee the immediate and effective implementation of this document.

At present there are no deputies in the USSR Supreme Soviet who represent and defend our interests, needs, and aspirations. In the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet they are an insignificant minority as a result of the antidemocratic nature of the recent election campaign and the entire situation in the republic. Therefore we have formed a Committee of USSR Citizens in Lithuania, which we have charged with representing and defending our interests.

So that our proposals may be stated, we request that representatives of this committee be received in the

USSR Supreme Soviet and that they be given the opportunity to speak at a session in the immediate future.

Comrade president! Comrade members of the USSR Supreme Soviet!

We believe and firmly hope that, guided by the will and support of the entire Soviet people, you will be able to defend your fellow citizens from the encroachments of political adventurers.

A resolution expressing support for the decrees of the special third Soviet Union Congress of People's Deputies was also adopted at the meeting.

Decree Implements Lithuanian Law on Press

90US0634A Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 18 Feb 90 p 1

[Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet decree on implementation of the Lithuanian Republic law on the press and other mass media]

[Text] The Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. That the Lithuanian SSR law on the press and other mass media will take effect as of 1 March 1990.

2. To propose that the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers resolve the questions connected with the enactment of this law within the period up to 1 March 1990.

3. That all mass media listed in Article 2 of this law, other than the official mass media, on the territory of the Lithuanian SSR undergo re-registration within a three-month period as of 1 March 1990 in accordance with the procedure determined by this law and also the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers.

4. That applications for the registration of mass media established following the enactment of this law are subject to an official tax.

5. To instruct the Lithuanian SSR Ministry of Justice to submit within the period up to 1 March 1990 for examination by the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet proposals on alterations and additions to current legislative instruments in accordance with the Lithuanian SSR law on the press and other mass media.

[Signed] A. Brazauskas, chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

L. Sabutis, secretary of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Vilnius, 9 February 1990.

More on Takeover of Vilnius Publishing House

PM1704084190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Apr 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "When Moods Change: Situation in Lithuanian SSR"]

[Text] Vilnius, 3 Apr—Representatives of USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs organs have taken a local publishing house under their protection. At the same time, four republic newspapers which express the interests of "Sajudis," the Lithuanian nationalist movement, and which were hitherto printed here have been denied permission to continue to use this printing facility. But SOVETSKAYA LITVA, the newspaper of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee (CPSU Platform), will at last be published at its own publishing house, not outside the republic.

J. Kuolelis, secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU Platform) Provisional Central Committee, commented on the news thus:

"The decision that the CPSU Central Committee's Lithuanian publishing house will stop printing RESPUBLICA, SOGLASIYE, ATGIMIMAS, GIMTASIS KRASTAS and a number of other publications expressing the 'Sajudis' viewpoint was made by the Lithuanian Communist Party Provisional Central Committee Bureau on the basis of the relevant CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers documents. The question of stopping the printing of the republic Supreme Soviet newspapers EKHO LITVY and KURIER VILENSKIJ is also being examined."

Explaining the adoption of the decision, J. Kuolelis stressed that it is a question of protecting CPSU property on Lithuanian territory and regularizing the activity of the Lithuanian publishing house belonging to the CPSU Central Committee.

"This step by us is perfectly legitimate and legally based," he said, "because the printing house is the Central Committee's property and we have a right to the normal publication of our newspapers and journals there. There can be no grounds for various misinterpretations or misunderstandings here. And as for ensuring the protection of this facility and of other party buildings in the republic which the Lithuanian authorities have already tried to transfer to certain cooperatives and social organizations, among them the Lithuanian Social Democratic Party, this is being done solely to protect party property."

J. Kuolelis announced that the publishing house will print SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Lithuanian, Russian, and Polish and the journal KOMMUNIST in Lithuanian and Russian.

Observers note that the euphoria over the republic's "independence" declared by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet has still not passed off. Newspapers and television

spent too long trying to persuade the republic's population that when "Sajudis" came to power there would be an unprecedented flourishing of democracy and the economy. That organization's leaders have now come to power. But instead of democracy and pluralism it is "Sajudis-style" unanimity that is being implanted with great persistence in Lithuania today. For example, on Sunday evening the relay of Leningrad television, which was popular with the population, was ended. There are calls to stop Moscow TV broadcasts too—they "displease" the "Sajudis" parliamentarians, who during the election campaign vowed loyalty to democracy, pluralism, and freedom of speech but are now acting contrary to their promises.

Nevertheless, judging by the events of recent days, the USSR president's appeals to the Lithuanian people and the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet have prompted certain "Sajudis" political leaders to think seriously. The heat of emotions and passions typical of their earlier speeches is increasingly giving way to sober reasoning. In principle the same can be said about certain Lithuanian parliamentary deputies. For example, V. Landsbergis' statements at the republic's Supreme Soviet session, which has resumed work, cannot be called very categorical or optimistic. He is no longer opposed to constructive dialogue "at any level with the USSR Government" and views the legal act on Lithuanian independence differently, although he has urged the republic's population to send personal to Moscow protests regarding the USSR president's appeals and wishes for the republic's full state independence, which, incidentally, is already being done.

It is also interesting that even some pro-"Sajudis" republic periodicals have been forced to recognize the impulsiveness and haste of the actions of the new leadership of the republic's parliament. For example, on 3 April the newspaper LIETUVOS RITAS said: "Let us be frank: The republic Supreme Soviet's decisions are not being fulfilled, they are not viable, the only reaction to this is... a kind of euphoria."

If political passions are still running high in the republic's upper echelons of power, the same cannot be said of the mood of labor collectives. Look, for example, at the work of enterprises in the Lithuanian capital, Vilnius. The grinding machine plant, for instance, has prepared the first batch of wood-processing lathes and high-precision universal circular grinders for shipment to an international exhibition in Spain: It is hoped that these machines will subsequently enable the enterprise to enter the foreign market. The design collective of the "Neris" production association is currently working on creating new equipment for the country's mixed feed production and the modernization of grass meal production units and consumer goods production units.

As for the capital's theater life, the opera "La Traviata" has been replaced by the ballet "The Blue Danube." Meanwhile in the concert halls you can hear Yu. Fedorov from Kiev playing the bayan and R. Matajtite and A. Vasiljauskas on the violin and piano.

In short, life goes on. But the main question—What next?—remains open.

Lithuanian Law on Property Published

904A0236A Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 22 Feb 90 pp 1, 3

["Law of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic on the Fundamentals of Ownership"]

[Text]**Article 1. Purposes of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Law on the Fundamentals of Ownership**

The purpose of this law is:

1) creation of the legal basis for restructuring the republic's economic system;

2) definition of the fundamentals and principles for the legal regulation of property relations enshrined by the Lithuanian SSR Constitution;

3) creation of the prerequisites for the efficient use of natural, material, and financial resources in order to raise the living standard of citizens of the Lithuanian SSR.

Article 2. Property in the Lithuanian SSR

Citizens' private property and the property of citizens associated in groups (collectives) and state property constitute property of the Lithuanian SSR.

All forms of property not prohibited by law are permitted in the Lithuanian SSR, namely, individual property, property of the family, the peasant farm, the cooperative, the joint-stock company, the economic association, public organizations, local self-management, state-owned and joint enterprises of the Lithuanian SSR and other states, and others.

The Lithuanian SSR maintains and stimulates forms of ownership which provide for the most efficient use of resources and afford opportunities for an increase in the living standard of all citizens of the Lithuanian SSR.

Article 3. Legal Enactments Regulating Property Relations

Property relations are regulated in accordance with this law by the Lithuanian SSR Civil Code, other laws of the Lithuanian SSR and also interstate treaties and treaties of the subjects of the right of ownership.

Article 4. Subjects of the Right of Ownership

Any physical entity and collective of physical entities with the right of legal entity and also the state may be a subject of the right of ownership.

Article 5. Objects of the Right of Ownership

The land, its interior, waters, forests, other flora and fauna and other natural resources, buildings, installations, equipment, economic and noneconomic complexes, money, securities, items of personal consumption, and other property are objects of the right of ownership.

Article 6. Right of Ownership of Products of Intellectual Activity

Works of science, art and literature, discoveries and inventions, industrial models, trademarks, and other products of intellectual activity are objects of intellectual property.

Intellectual property relations are regulated by special laws.

Article 7. Exclusive Property of the Lithuanian SSR

The land, its interior, inland and territorial waters, forests, and other flora and fauna are the national property of the republic and the exclusive property of the Lithuanian SSR.

The right of ownership of the interior may belong only to the Lithuanian state. Other objects of the exclusive ownership of the Lithuanian SSR may on an ownership basis also belong to Lithuanian SSR citizens and collectives which they form with the status of legal entity.

Persons who are not citizens of the Lithuanian SSR and legal entities of other states may avail themselves of objects of the exclusive ownership of the Lithuanian SSR only in the procedure determined by law, given permission issued by state authorities of the Lithuanian SSR.

The procedure and conditions of the use of objects of the exclusive ownership of the Lithuanian SSR are regulated by special laws of the Lithuanian SSR.

Article 8. Property of Persons Who Are Not Citizens of the Lithuanian SSR, Legal Entities of Other States, Other States and International Organizations on the Territory of the Lithuanian SSR

The right of ownership is recognized for persons who are not citizens of the Lithuanian SSR, legal entities of other states, international organizations and foreign states on the territory of the Lithuanian SSR unless otherwise determined by the laws of the Lithuanian SSR.

The list of objects of the ownership of other states and international organizations and also objects of the joint ownership of the Lithuanian SSR and other states and the duration and terms of their presence on the territory of the Lithuanian SSR are determined by the laws of the Lithuanian SSR and interstate treaties.

Article 9. Content of the Rights of Proprietor

The proprietor enjoys independent possession of the property belonging to him and utilizes and disposes of it in accordance with the laws of the Lithuanian SSR.

Article 10. Realization of the Rights of Proprietor

The proprietor has the right to utilize the property belonging to him in all economic and other activity not prohibited by law.

The right of ownership may not be realized in violation of the property rights or legitimate interests of other persons, legal entities and the state.

The law may determine instances and conditions where the proprietor is obliged to transfer use of his property to other persons and organizations or the state.

Article 11. Wage Labor

The owner of property or some entitled owner of property has the right in accordance with the laws of the Lithuanian SSR to hire other persons.

Article 12. Right of Ownership to the Results of Economic Activity

Products and income obtained from the use of property in economic activity belong to the owner of the property.

The results of economic activity from the use of leased property on an ownership basis belong to the lessee.

The law or a contract may determine other rules of the formation of the right of ownership to the results of economic activity.

Article 13. Right of Ownership of Physical Entities

Physical entities in the Lithuanian SSR are permitted to have, on the basis of ownership, any property if this or other laws do not prohibit the right to private ownership or other restrictions on private property have not been established.

Article 14. Right of Common Ownership

Property may belong, on a common ownership basis, to two or several physical or legal entities, these subjects and the state and also several states.

The right of common ownership may be several with determination therein of the share of each proprietor, and in instances determined by law or treaty on the amalgamation of property, joint, without determination of the share of the proprietors.

The amalgamation of property belonging to physical entities and groups thereof (collectives) and also the state by way of the creation of forms of the right of mixed ownership is authorized.

Article 15. Realization of the Right of Common Ownership

The procedure of the possession, enjoyment and disposal of property belonging on the basis of common ownership to several proprietors is determined by civil legislation of the Lithuanian SSR and contracts concluded with proprietors in the procedure determined by law.

Arguments between proprietors arising in connection with the possession, enjoyment and disposal of common property are settled by a court of law, arbitration or a third court.

Article 16. Right of Collective Ownership

For the exercise of economic or other activity not prohibited by law physical entities may pool property by associating in a collective with its registration as a legal entity. The pooled property of the physical entities belongs, on an ownership basis, to the legal entity, who possesses, enjoys and disposes of this property in accordance with the laws of the Lithuanian SSR and its provisions (statutes).

Any property, unless otherwise stipulated by law or the regulations (statutes) governing the legal entity, may belong to legal entities on an ownership basis.

Article 17. Objects of the Right of State Ownership

Belonging on a state ownership basis to the Lithuanian SSR are:

1) natural resources, except for those belonging on an ownership basis to other subjects of ownership;

2) material resources intended for the exercise of the functions of the higher and local state authorities and also administrative and executive functions of the Lithuanian SSR;

3) part of the material resources belonging to the Lithuanian SSR in common ownership with other republics which are a part of the USSR;

4) property of the state banks, enterprises and organizations;

5) financial resources forming the republic and local budgets and also part of the resources of the USSR budget belonging to the Lithuanian SSR per treaty or on another basis.

Article 18. Realization of the Right of State Ownership

Rights to the possession, enjoyment and disposal of property belonging on the basis of state ownership to the Lithuanian SSR are exercised by the higher and local organs of state power and also the administrative and executive authorities of the Lithuanian SSR in accordance with the Lithuanian SSR Constitution and other laws.

Most important questions concerning the property of the republic appertaining on the basis of state ownership are decided by the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Property belonging to the republic on the basis of state ownership may be transferred to citizens or collectives thereof for a fee or free of charge in the procedure determined by law.

State regulation of the activity of the republic and local economy pertain to the competence of the organs of state administration of the Lithuanian SSR. The competence of the organs of administration in this sphere are determined by special laws.

Part of the property belonging to the republic on the basis of state ownership is transferred by the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet to the ownership of local self-management. The property relations of local self-management are regulated by the Lithuanian SSR Law on the Fundamentals of Local Self-Management and other laws.

Article 19. Nationalization

In exceptional cases for the purpose of protecting the interests of the republic, property belonging on an ownership basis to physical entities and groups thereof (collectives) and other states may by a special law be taken into state ownership with the payment to the proprietor of compensation.

Article 20. Guarantees and Protection of the Rights of the Proprietor

The Lithuanian SSR guarantees all proprietors equality in the defense of their rights.

No one has the right:

1) to take property from a proprietor forcibly, except in instances stipulated by laws of the Lithuanian SSR;

2) to demand of a proprietor the amalgamation with someone or other of his property against his will.

Property may be taken from a proprietor against his will only in accordance with the decision or ruling of a court of law and also in accordance with a special law on nationalization or a requisition instrument. A proprietor must be reimbursed the value of confiscated property, except in cases where property is confiscated by way of penalty for a legal infringement.

The Lithuanian SSR guarantees the right of inheritance.

The Lithuanian SSR protects the rights of all subjects of the right of ownership to their property located in other states.

[Signed]**A. Brazauskas, chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium**

L. Sabutis, secretary of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, Vilnius, 12 February 1990.

Lithuanian Control of Nuclear Safety Questioned

904E0081A Moscow TRUD in Russian 28 Mar 90 p 3

[Article by Yu. Dmitriyev: "An Atomic Genie? Truth and Rumors About the Ignalina AES in Lithuania"]

[Text] As everybody knows the Lithuanian parliament decided to secede from the Soviet Union. The idea of secession covers the industries of the republic, its offices,

transportation, and communication services, and it also includes the Ignalina AES [nuclear electric power station]. The station is part of the all-union network of control, management, and fuel supply and this decision, therefore, cannot but cause most serious concern.

There are strict regulations in existence meant to provide for safe operation of nuclear power stations. They include regular check ups of the equipment for safety, scheduled examinations and maintenance work, a specific order of fuel supplies and of the nuclear waste disposal, which is supposed to be buried later. All that is done under a strict control provided by the union services and agencies, starting with the USSR Gospromatomnadzor [State Inspection for Nuclear Energy in Industry]. Thus any "independence" and local initiative are excluded since one might have to pay too dearly for taking risks or for the smallest mistake. Our Lithuanian comrades were told about that firmly and resolutely. Even more, measures have been taken to bring in military units to ensure tighter security at the AES proper. But contrary to the rumors spread over the republic there are no tanks at the station.

"The Ignalina AES is located about a hundred kilometers from Vilnius, on Drukshyay lake," says N.A. Shteinberg, USSR Gospromatomnadzor deputy chairman. "Six km away from the AES site is Snechkus, a power workers' village with 40,000 people living in it. They started to build the station in 1976. At first they planned to erect four units with RBMK-type [high power channel] reactors with 1,500 megawatt capacity. The first unit was started in 1983 and the second in 1987. As demanded by the people of the republic, they stopped construction of the third unit after using up about half of the capital investments. The decision was made by the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers. At present the Ignalina AES can satisfy about a third of the total power demand of the Lithuanian SSR.

"Several times representatives of the IAEA [International Atomic Energy Agency] were invited to the Ignalina AES. An OSSET [expansion unknown] mission confirmed that the station was sufficiently secure as recently as late 1989.

"After the Chernobyl disaster measures were taken at all RBMK-type reactors, including the Ignalina one, to increase the level of their safe operation. However, we have to admit openly that the reactor cannot totally comply with the heightened requirements of the present time. The only condition is to provide the high quality operation of the station units and it can be guaranteed only through qualified supervision of all the work involved.

"Last month the Lithuanian industrial safety inspection asked that we transfer the Ignalina AES from our inspection to theirs," continues N.A. Shteinberg, "in fact they were talking of making the station subordinate to the republican authorities. They suggested that the union agencies are left with only the so-called "methodology guidance".

"In our opinion, such an approach cannot ensure that the control over the AES safe operation will be conducted at the required quality level. We reminded our Lithuanian colleagues of a fact which should be well known to them: The station design is not in full compliance with the present safety norms and requirements. That was the reason in the past for the committee to put limits on the capacity of both power units.

"I want to reiterate that only the union agencies, with their powerful scientific and personnel potential, can provide the required control over the station operation, over the work of its machines and systems. It is doubtful that this can be achieved by the few people from the AES inspection whose only duty is to provide operational supervision.

"As we can see from the tragic experience of AES accidents, their devastating aftermath is not limited by national boundaries. This is especially important to remember when we talk about a republic as small as Lithuania. The leaders of the republic should comprehend all this quite clearly before they decide to take upon themselves the responsibility for the operation of the Ignalina AES. Whichever way events in Lithuania proceed, the people of our country and of other countries cannot relieve the union agencies of their responsibility for the AES safe operation. That is why the problem of handing the Ignalina station over to Lithuanian jurisdiction should not be resolved hastily and without proper consideration or just plain common sense."

We cannot but note here also the obvious inconsistency and strange evolution in the views of the Sajudis leaders. Some two or three years ago they demanded that all AES's be closed. Prestigious commissions were sent to the Drukshyay Lake area from the Minatomenergo [Ministry of Atomic Power], Minsredmash [Ministry of Medium Machine Building], Kurchatov Atomic Energy Institute and other agencies, not to mention the well publicized mission of the IAEA nuclear safety department head Moris Rozen [name as published]. All of them confirmed that the machines were reliable enough and there was no danger of radiation leaks. The measurements of the radiation levels did not cause any concern either. But the arguments continued anyway. The construction of the third station unit had to be stopped, in spite of the R260 million that had already been sunk into it. And now that very Sajudis has made an unexpected 180 degree turn.

Nobody intended to ruin the station which is actually so indispensable for the republic that does not have sufficient resources of power and fuel of its own. But to make the station into some kind of private property for the republic means to take an unreasonable step: The degree of risk is too great and not only for Lithuania but also for

the neighboring soviet republics, krays and oblasts, as well as the European countries nearby.

Ozolas Interviewed on Cultural Affairs

90UN1380B Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian
21 Mar 90 p 1

[Interview with Romualdas Ozolas by ELTA correspondent R. Grumadayte, date and place not specified: "Romualdas Ozolas: 'I Know What I Want and Have To Do'"]

[Text] [Grumadayte] Your position is becoming strategically important for the policy of the republic now that the Constitution of the republic has codified a multiparty system, and the single party has lost its leading and guiding role. Have you already developed an action program or, perhaps, put together a team of like-minded people?

[Ozolas] If you do not know what needs to be done hardly anyone can help. I know both what I want and what I have to do. I know the conceptual thrust of my activities, and the most significant long-term undertakings have taken shape. It is just that our opportunities are, perhaps, going to be considerably more limited than we would like them to be.

First of all, we need to emancipate the individual for creativity in the sphere of culture, beginning with those who interpret culture as something utilitarian and on to the highest level of its creators—artists, scientists, and other intellectuals. The elimination of the old structures of managing culture, which restrict the freedom of the individual and hamper the manifestation of culture is the second, very important endeavor. Third, a system of state priorities and the financing of culture needs to be created. All of the above would promote the individualization and pluralism of culture and of all programs of state assistance to culture. The goal is to make the people more involved in creativity, life, and work. The family should be given special attention, in which the role of the woman and mother should be emphasized. Our society itself must become more courageous in the broadest meaning of this word—more resolute, specific, and hard-working, and should not go along with the status quo. Courage should be manifested as the beginning of vigor and involvement by our society. Finally, the essence of all of this is to make our life rational. We have a duty to learn to value wisdom, clarity, precision, and feasibility above emotional factors.

[Grumadayte] You were considered to be the ideologist of Sajudis, the generator of ideas. Now you are the ideologist in the government of the republic. Will your program of actions and goals change?

[Ozolas] Whether I was such or was considered to be such changes nothing. Being with Sajudis, I attempted to interpret the values and ideals of life as the assets of all Lithuania rather than just of Sajudis. However, at the time these were the goals of a culture proceeding toward self-assertion, whereas now they have become those of a state. This is why the situation is changing. We will have to be more careful, while preserving our own postulates: spirituality as the principal parameter of our life, rationality as a mode of manifesting spirituality and its primacy over others, trustworthiness as a way to materialize culture. We will have to balance differences in opinions very carefully. Apparently, the ideological-political struggle, which is a remarkable fact of spiritual life in its own right, will consist of such opinions. The struggle would testify to our everyday existence, our ability to live. This is why the principle of taking the interests of the minority into account becomes particularly important—not one phenomenon that may become an important part of the development of our future culture can be suppressed. It is the priority of the state's cultural policy to be astute in this field. I believe that no state can operate without a state cultural policy. However, if it idealizes the cultural involvement of individuals in this field, I believe that such a state may be hopeful about the achieving cultural pluralism in principle.

[Grumadayte] You are going to be in charge of the mighty assets of the mass media and propaganda. The thrust of forming public opinion has depended on them...

[Ozolas] I will try to understand what people in specific areas of activity think. If we are going to agree on common objectives it will only be by consensus. This is the main guideline. I am stressing once again—only on the basis of understanding and consensus. Those who believe that this is unacceptable and unnecessary are free to go and engage in work they do consider necessary, in what appears credible to them. However, they themselves should be responsible for this and should not demand tutelage. Authenticity needs to be supported in principle, morally, as a prerequisite for the ethics of our culture in the implementation of which both the individual and the state are equal subjects.

[Grumadayte] Previously, one had to be a party member in order to hold a position in the government. At present, a different trend is emerging—toward deideologizing and negating party affiliation. What is your attitude toward this?

[Ozolas] In principle and in essence, I am a nonparty person. However, I was a member of the Communist Party for many years and was even a member of its leadership, to be sure, for a short time. I have paid for everything one is supposed to pay for when he makes such a decision. Perhaps one day I will get an opportunity to discuss this not only in the genre of journalistic notes. I believed then and I do now that all political expression is possible through sociopolitical organizations. This is a party definition of the ideological affiliation of the people. This is why the parties are necessary in principle. The Communist Party was a structure for exercising power rather than a party. It still continues to live off its own momentum. I believe that it should

remain a communist party to the end, until the very idea evaporates from the minds of the people. Undoubtedly, other parties should appear; throwing away party membership cards en masse is an unhealthy phenomenon unless it is a consequence of an inner necessity felt by the people.

[Grumadayte] At one time, the pendulum of ideology swung one way. At present, it is moving in the opposite direction, and it should reach the same point on the opposite side, because as a result of inertia it cannot stop at midpoint. That is to say, one antidemocracy may replace another one...

[Ozolas] If our society so wishes, a new antidemocracy will appear. It needs to be understood that the leaders do not make policy—they merely express it. If a society has not developed in the direction of leader worship, leaders such as Lenin or Stalin or the entire constellation that followed cannot appear. Those like them come about along only by virtue of a certain momentum. However, the mass is the bearer of momentum, according to a law of physics. The citizens of Lithuania have an opportunity to oppose eventual dictatorship. Meanwhile, conditions for the existence of authoritarianism are still present. After all, many people interpret politics as liking a particular person, regardless of the ideas advocated by him. If we are to avoid this, we should see the idea the person stands for rather than the person himself. Our way of thinking, imposed on us during the Soviet years, is not without flaws. However, the parties are growing quickly, the public organizations are strong; I think that the collective political wisdom of Lithuania will not allow authoritarianism to be manifested even if there were grounds for it to appear. However, I repeat once again that nobody is capable of protecting us from it; only we can defend ourselves.

[Grumadayte] You ended up with the field that is poorest from the point of view of financing—culture, education, social issues. Are you afraid that your ideas will not be borne out by reality? Do you have an emergency scenario prepared in case of this?

[Ozolas] Our whole culture is in a disastrous situation. Indeed, the situation is unenviable, but I am not losing faith. This is why we need to determine expeditiously who needs the aid of the state, and to identify everything that can become the subject of private initiative. At the same time, this would be yet another step in streamlining our society. State resources will be found for the development of cultural phenomena that will play a certain role in the nation. I attach much hope to the aid offered by public organizations. I believe that the people will be able to implement their cultural plans on their own initiative. After all, until now the state has financed absolutely everything. This is why a unidimensional culture developed here.

[Grumadayte] Who are you going to work with? What is your attitude toward the current apparatus: Will you reorganize it, replace it with new people, your assistants?

[Ozolas] I have several fellow workers, future aides. I have drawn on their support before. Genuine comrades-in-arms are found only in the process of work. However, I do not have a biased attitude toward someone in the previous culture apparatus. Conditions for work and an opportunity for self-expression will be available to all. If they can keep pace they will always be welcome. I hope that the number of like-minded people will continually grow.

Legal Expert Interviewed on Lithuanian Situation

PM1604150190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Apr 90 First Edition p 4

[Interview with Doctor of Juridical Sciences P.G. Semenov, senior scientific associate of the USSR Academy of Sciences State and Law Institute, by TASS correspondent V. Saklakov in Moscow; no date of interview given: "Separatism: Illusions and Reality. Legal Expert's Opinion of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet's Actions"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [Saklakov] The way I understand it, by adopting this law [on the secession of Union republics from the USSR] which came into force immediately, we have given the champions of Lithuania's separation from the USSR an opportunity to act strictly according to juridical rules?

[Semenov] Precisely so. Not by going as far as ultimatums—we have seceded from the Union's structure, so let us conduct talks—but by acting completely legitimately, on a solid legal basis, with due consideration for international juridical practice. Incidentally, the second paragraph of the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution on the procedure for introducing this draft law is noteworthy. This is what it says: "To establish that any actions connected with the formulation of the question of a Union republic's secession from the USSR which run counter to the USSR Law 'On the Procedure for Resolving Questions Connected with a Union Republic's Secession From the USSR' and which are undertaken both before and after its enactment entail no legal consequences either for the USSR or for the Union republics."

[Saklakov] Consequently, there is only one legal and logically correct way—a referendum.

[Semenov] Yes, this step can be taken, once the draft laws hastily adopted by the republic's Supreme Soviet since 10 March have been repealed.

[Saklakov] But what if the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet refuses to recognize this law? After all, people over there are already tirelessly repeating that the USSR is a separate state and its legislation has no effect in the republic.

[Semenov] Should this happen, it is possible to introduce presidential rule, which would mean pushing aside [otstraneniye] all relevant republican organs of power, starting with the Supreme Soviet.

[Saklakov] Could a referendum on the Union republic's secession from the state be held in conditions of such rule?

[Semenov] The law is silent on this point. Generally speaking, no referendums are held in such circumstances. You can see for yourself that this would obviously not be to the benefit of the Lithuanian population. I think that there is a more feasible alternative: The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet repeals the decisions it has adopted between 11 March and today, and its subsequent actions start complying with Soviet legislation. This is the only correct, juridically substantiated, and honest way.

Specialist Views Lithuanian Resolutions

LD1204190390 Moscow TASS in English 1820 GMT 12 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 12 TASS—By TASS correspondent Viktor Saklakov:

"Actions of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, which hastily proclaimed the republic's new status, were a vivid manifestation of legal voluntarism." says Doctor of Law Pavel Semenov, specialist in Soviet national-territorial building who works at the Institute of State and Law.

"Nationalistic bias prevents many people who have taken Lithuania to the verge of secession from seeing things as they are," he said in an interview with TASS.

"The argument that economic relations with the Soviet Union will remain unchanged after secession is naive," the scholar believes. "Sajudis want to milk the cow without feeding it. They have delivered an ultimatum to a great power and are pressing for maximum benefit from the split. But it should be remembered that to date Lithuania has had an unfair trade turnover with the rest of the country, receiving more than it gave back."

Recalling that although Article 72 of the USSR Constitution proclaimed the right of republics to withdraw from the Soviet Union unilaterally, Semenov noted that until recently there was no mechanism for secession. The other day, the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted the relevant law which stipulates the need to hold a referendum in a situation of this kind. Only if two thirds of the population favour secession the decision becomes valid.

"The law lays down a five-year transition period during which Soviet laws remain in effect on given territory," Semenov said. "During the transition period, all political, military, economic and humanitarian problems must be settled. In the Lithuanian case, also territorial disputes. The republic will have to return the Klaipeda area, which was transferred to the Soviet Union by Germany in its time, and some other areas measuring nearly 4,000 square kilometers that used to be part of Belorussia. The status of Vilnius and the Vilnius area with its numerous Polish population also needs reassessment."

Speaking about the possible introduction of direct presidential rule in Lithuanian, Semenov noted that it would mean the suspension of all republican bodies of authority, beginning with the Supreme Soviet. However, he believes that another way is more plausible—the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet should repeal its resolutions with Soviet legislation. "This is the only correct, law-based and honest way," Semenov believes.

Landsbergis Urges New Swedish Stance

PM1204151390 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 11 Apr 90 p A4

[Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis "Debate" article: "Landsbergis Calls for New Swedish Stance"]

[Text] On 16 February 1918 the Lithuanian people reestablished their state independence. In the two subsequent years they defended it successfully through diplomatic and armed struggle. Latvia, Estonia, and Finland also succeeded in winning their independence at the same time.

Unfortunately these Nordic peoples were forced to achieve their independence as states in a region where the imperialist aspirations of the surrounding great powers overlapped. The struggle between Berlin and Moscow to incorporate the regions of the Balto-Scandinavian peoples began in 1939. Of the four states mentioned above only Finland succeeded in defending its state independence—and at a high price. The others were brutally and violently incorporated into the Soviet empire.

Relations between Sweden and Lithuania in the period between the wars were full of goodwill, trust, trade, and cultural exchange. During these 22 years between 1918 and 1940 hundreds of young Lithuanians graduated from Western universities. Many of them visited and studied in Sweden. Lithuania developed in a northern and Western European cultural and economic context and used the Scandinavian countries as an example.

Unfortunately the inhumanly brutal Soviet, Nazi, and later again Soviet powers began to engage in the genocide of the Lithuanian people. By controlling education and culture they tried to falsify our country's history and cut us off from our closest neighbors. Is it not absurd that an ordinary Swede knew more about Japan than about his neighbors who lived only a couple of hundred kilometers from Gotland, while Lithuanians who wanted to visit Sweden had to travel there via Moscow, more than 1,000 km to the east?

In May 1941 the Swedish Government recognized the annexation of Lithuania. Is it not now time to correct this shameful political act, which aimed at winning the favor of the Stalinist empire? Would it not be fitting for Sweden to adopt the same political stance on Lithuania as Norway, Denmark, and Iceland?

Today it is exactly a month since we reestablished our own state. We have neither weapons nor soldiers, only our souls' determination, our tenacity, and cohesion. We are now the targets for a show of brutal military force, and attempts are being made to isolate our little country from the rest of the world.

But since 11 March in this part of the Balto-Scandinavian region, surrounded by tanks, helicopters, and KGB agents, beat 3.5 million hearts which love freedom and their state's independence. We are in no doubt that this rhythm of freedom can be heard all the way to our close neighbors, the Swedish people.

For an open and moral world! For the right of every nation—including the small—to choose its own path, its own destiny!

Danish Paper Cited on Sajudis 'Disinformation'

PM1704092990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Apr 90 Second Edition p 1

[Own correspondent Yu. Kuznetsov dispatch: "Unsensationalistic Coverage of Lithuania. Danish Newspaper's Opinion"]

[Text] Helsinki, 13 Apr—"Can 100 foreign journalists in Lithuania really be wrong?" asks a commentary in the Copenhagen newspaper INFORMATION. The reply, regrettably, is: "Yes, they can."

Whichever way you want to look at them the reports from Vilnius, it goes on to say, smack of journalistic sensationalism, whereby journalists stick microphones under people's noses and ask them: "What did Landsbergis state? When will Soviet tanks invade Lithuania from the south? Will Copenhagen be the main venue for talks between Vilnius and Moscow?"

These reports were not imbued with any willingness or desire to explain what solution there could be to the situation apart from a military solution. Perhaps this is because many journalists still associate the Soviet Union of 1990 with the 1979-model Soviet Union. Perhaps because reports of imminent death and misfortune sell better.

Moreover, there is much to suggest that Lithuania's "Sajudis" independence movement has been engaged in deliberate disinformation over the past few weeks... This, of course, could and should be regretted, but it is clearly part of the game...

Commission on Eastern Lithuania Formed

90UN1409E Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 23 March 90 p 3

[Decree of the Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council on Formation of a Temporary Commission for Problems of Eastern Lithuania]

[Text] The Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council resolves:

To form a temporary commission for problems of Eastern Lithuania composed of the following:

Stanislav Akanovich; Zbignev Baltsevich; Yulyus Beynortas; Egidiyus Klumbis; Stasis Kropas; Cheslovas Kudaba; Ryshard Matseykyanets; Cheslav Okinchits; Vytautas Palyunas; Stanislav Peshko; Eugeniyus Petrovas; Vidmantas Povilenis; Lyudvikas-Nartsizas Rasmavichyus; Romualdas Rudzis; Benediktas-Vilmantas Rupeyka; Valentina Suboch; Rimvidas-Raymondas Survila; Aurimas Taurantas; Edvard Tomashevich; Kazimeras Uoka; Cheslovas Yurshenas; Leon Yankelevich.

[Signed] V. LANDSBERGIS, chairman of the Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council.
Vilnius, 20 March 1990.

National Group Poll in Vilnius Reported

LD1504174190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1835 GMT 13 Apr 90

[From the "View" program]

[Text] [video shows unidentified correspondent in an office where a woman and a man are seated at a desk with a video display unit (VDU) in front of them]

[Correspondent] One of the latest studies done by the VTsIOM, the All-Union Center for the Study of Public Opinion, concerns the situation in Lithuania. Its results are now presented for us by one of the staff of VTsIOM, (Irina Koneva). Tell me, why did you do this study only in Vilnius?

[(Koneva)] Vilnius interested us greatly because half the city's population are non-Lithuanians, representatives of other national groups—Russians, Poles, and others. That is why we chose Vilnius.

[Correspondent] Yes, and it is especially important now to know their opinions. So what did your study reveal? I see you have a graph on your VDU screen.

[Video shows close-up of VDU, which contains a pie-chart divided into three colored sectors, with the significance of these colors and the corresponding percentages listed in English alongside. They are: Yes—72 percent; No—21 percent; Don't Know—seven percent.

[(Koneva)] Well, 72 percent said yes...

[Correspondent, interrupting] Yes in reply to what?

[(Koneva)] One of the main questions...well, the main question we asked in our study concerned the respondents' attitude to the decision by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet on restoration of statehood.

[Correspondent] So you asked: Do you support that decision?

[(Koneva)] Yes: Do you support that decision? And 72 percent of the people of Vilnius answered Yes; 21 percent answered No; and seven percent could not say.

[Correspondent, interrupting] So around one-fifth...

[(Koneva)] Practically three-quarters were in favor of the decision. And the picture is even more interesting because now we can see here how the answers are distributed within national groups.

[Video shows close-up of VDU screen with a vertical bar chart, with percentages marked on the vertical axis and containing two groups of bars labelled YES and NO. Each group consists of three colored bars corresponding to Lithuanians, Russians, and Poles, and these appear to represent the following approximate percentages. These figures are not actually marked on the screen]

	YES	NO (Percent)
Lithuanians	93	3
Russians	40	40
Poles	58	30

[(Koneva)] So, what can we see here? Support for the Supreme Soviet decision was voiced by practically all Lithuanians, but in adition, by 58 percent of Poles...

[Correspondent, interrupting] In other words, around two-thirds of Poles supported the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet's decision on restoration of independent statehood.

[(Koneva)] And exactly half of Russians declared themselves in support...in other words an equal number of Russian answered no...

[Correspondent] Both yes and no. So an equal number of Russians are for and against the decision.

[(Koneva)] So the Russian population of Lithuanian is divided evenly in half.

[Correspondent] I believe there was another question you asked, about the likelihood of the use of military force. What does this chart show?

[Video close-up of VDU screen shows another bar chart with bars grouped as before. The percentages, as viewed, appear to be approximately as follows. Again they are not specified on the VDU display]

	YES	NO (Percent)
Lithuanians	17	76
Russians	17	70
Poles	24	55

[(Koneva)] This chart shows the optimism of the people of Vilnius. Of the people of Vilnius, 72 percent rule out the use of military force.

The main result to emerge from this study is that the impression that exists of a division of Lithuanian society into Lithuanians and non-Lithuanians where this main political issue is concerned does not reflect the true state of affairs. The results of our poll refute that. In other words, what we see is that the main watershed occurs not between Lithuanians and non-Lithuanians but within the national groups. That is illustrated best of all by the case of the Russians who are rather prettily divided in half—fifty-fifty for and against.

[Announcer] [Video continues to show correspondent in conversations with (Koneva)] That study was done a week ago. The VTsIOM data might appear paradoxical, but they are based on results obtained by one of the country's major sociological research networks.

Activities by Baltic 'Provocateurs' Cited

PM0604103990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Mar 90 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Who Is Sowing the Seeds of Dissension?"]

[Text] Two sixth-grade students were attacked by four young people near an old cemetery in the town of Prenay, Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. They were both beaten up, and one had his young pioneer neckerchief torn off. The victims were the children of servicemen.

Some people may not consider this incident very important against the backdrop of the events currently taking place in the Baltic republics. And yet... Young pioneers' red neckerchiefs are being torn off and monuments to liberator servicemen dismantled, while plaques are being erected in honor of SS men.

Those are the dangerous shoots, not least among young people, that have been sprouted from the seeds of nationalism and enmity between peoples sown by separatist and extremist elements.

Such incidents are rightly seen as a consequence of the anti-Army campaign that has been launched in the region and during which disinformation and slanderous statements have been widely pressed into service. Thus, in an appearance on republic television, D. Ivans, one of the leaders of the Latvian People's Front, claimed without substantiation that Soviet Army servicemen are forcibly disarming the militia in Lithuania. In response to this, Ivans claimed, the Latvian People's Front should recruit and send to Lithuania volunteers from among the republic's militiamen. It is not hard to imagine what consequences could ensue from such provocative statements.

The decision by the Estonian People's Front to send its own envoys to Soviet Army units to persuade Estonian servicemen to desert is also inflammatory. The ultimate aim of the provocateurs, who are playing with young people's careers and encouraging them to break their military oath, is to use former servicemen to set up so-called self-defense detachments—the "kaitseliit" ("defense union").

"Sajudis" organs are continuing to register volunteers for "regional defense" subunits. According to a statement by Lithuania's "Defense Minister" Z. Vayshvila, the future "Lithuanian Army" should number 38,500 men. There is a military group of reserve officers in "Sajudis" based on officers from the former 16th Lithuanian Division. Their aims include propagandizing the traditions of the old Lithuanian Army, working with predraft youngsters, and setting up national formations.

Separatist forces in a number of Estonian and Latvian cities have organized rallies at which, in particular, calls have been made for funds to be collected and for volunteer fighters to be enrolled to help "independent" Lithuania.

Under these conditions, opposition to the provocateurs and instigators who are eager to achieve their selfish aims and political ambitions is becoming a matter of honor for all truly patriotic and internationalist forces.

Comparison of Gorbachev Letter to Lithuania

PM1504173790

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 14 April 1990 carries in its Second Edition on page 1 a letter from M. Gorbachev and N. Ryzhkov to the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers. Comparison of the PRAVDA item with the translation of the Moscow Domestic Russian version published in the 13 April Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, beginning on page 56, revealing the following variations:

Page 56, column one, second paragraph, sentence one, PRAVDA begins [Text] To the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, To the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers

The problem of the republic's position within the union state, which has been.... (deleting Moscow Domestic Russian introductory paragraph; adding addressees and the word "state")

Third paragraph, sentence two in PRAVDA reads "...service is a most crude violation of the..." (adding the word "most")

Fourth paragraph, sentence two in PRAVDA reads "...aimed at undermining political and socioeconomic stability in the country, harm the democratic processes..." (adding passage).

Fifth paragraph, sentence one in PRAVDA reads "The other Union republics are rightly..." (replacing the word "Soviet" with "Union")

last paragraph, last sentence in PRAVDA reads "M. Gorbachev, president of the USSR; N. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers" (adding signatories)

Ryuytel Discusses Conversation With Gorbachev

LD1604130590

[Editorial Report] Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian at 1700 GMT on 14 April broadcasts a report on a "conversation" with M. Gorbachev, N.I. Ryzhkov, E. Shevardnadze, A.J. Lukyanov, and A. YA. Yakovlev, during a break in the session of the Presidential Council and afterwards. The conversation is led by Arnold Ryuytel, chairman of the Estonian Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Ryuytel talks about his conversation with Gorbachev. He says that the resolution of the Estonian Supreme Soviet about the transitional period had caused a fair amount of misunderstanding and the ensuing telephone conversation between Gorbachev and Ryuytel had not been sufficient.

Ryuytel says: "First and foremost Mikhail Gorbachev holds the position that at present he [words indistinct] as talks but then one must sit around a table and—let us even call it a dialogue. And then, at the dialogue level we would then present all of our problems which have accumulated over the years [word indistinct] and we will agree—like it is with any kind of talks—that it is necessary to prepare all these questions on the side of both parties. And he said in this respect that on his part the members of the Presidential Council will make preparations within the framework of different problems and he asked that we, too, make preparations in the framework of specific persons and questions.

And once those preparations and meetings have taken place then we will sit down at a higher level, with both parties on either side of the table and we will then lead this dialogue to some kind of an end, down to a specific resolution. I endeavored during these conversations [to achieve] this aim that political stability would be preserved in our republic, both in economy as well as simply in daily political life, and that we would indeed—as we have repeatedly emphasized—be able to present our problems calmly and [to be able] to take all the steps in the name of our far-reaching aims."

Status of Estonian Communist Party Reported

LD1604153890 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Text] Estonia's Communist Party will stay within the Communist Party of the Soviet Union until next October. The Estonian communists have determined such a status of their party at the 20th congress held in the republic. A [word indistinct] adopted at the congress says Estonia's Communist Party will work on the basis of principles resting on the universal humane values of Marxism and new political thinking. The delegates said they expected the Estonian communists to work for the good of their homeland, from which civil peace, cooperation, and a calm and constructive solution to all problems are indispensable. The coalition's Central Committee provides an example of such cooperation. It

comprises two factions, one favoring the total independence of Estonian communists; the other standing for unity with the CPSU. Each of the 106,000 Estonian communists is to make his choice by autumn.

Deputies Deplore Estonian Law on Military Service

PM1704083990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Apr 90 First Edition p 4

[Special correspondent Captain Second Rank S. Turchenko dispatch under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Estonia: Law... On Evasion of Service"]

[Text] Tallinn, 12 Apr—The second session of the Estonian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet sat until late at night on 11 April discussing a draft law which was finally entitled "On Service by Estonian SSR Citizens in the USSR Armed Forces During the Transitional Period." It was eagerly awaited by many people in the republic, since previous legislative decisions by the Estonian parliament (which were already reported by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA) deadlocked the situation as regards the spring draft and army service in general. In my view, however, the new draft law aggravated the situation further still. Judge for yourselves.

Its basic provisions are as follows. Deeming the USSR Law "On Universal Military Service" and USSR Council of Ministers Resolution 305 to be ineffective on Estonian SSR territory. Abolition of the Estonian SSR Criminal Code article providing punishment for evasion of service and failure to obey call-up orders. Rehabilitation of Estonian residents sentenced for evasion of military service. A ban on enterprises, institutions, and organizations getting involved in call-up measures. The draft law also stipulates that the procedure governing service by Estonians currently in the USSR Armed Forces and discharge from it will be laid down by the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet and coordinated with the Soviet Union Government.

Thus, the draft law creates a dilemma for Estonian teenagers of call-up age. On the one hand, there is the USSR Constitution and unionwide laws on military service; on the other hand, a provocatively inciting legal act (there are no other words to describe it) which holds out a promise: You can break the USSR laws and nothing will happen to you.

Quite a few sober voices were heard while this draft law was under discussion. Deputies N. Aksinin, Z. Abdurakhmanov, N. Zakharov, and others warned parliament against an ill-considered decision prompting Estonian soldiers to desert and draftees to evade service. N. Zakharov drew the deputies' attention to the fact that the draft law is at odds not only with unionwide legal acts but also with the Estonian SSR Constitution. This was instantaneously (and, in my view, quite cynically) parried by M. Lauristin, deputy chairman (speaker) of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet:

"Our Constitution contains too many moral and ethical terms. Duty, honor, obligation—these are moral terms. They must be voluntarily obeyed."

What can you say: Lofty morality by a parliamentarian who grants indulgences to Estonian youth for getting out of defending the country!

The law was adopted by a majority of votes. One deputy described it, not in a very parliamentary fashion but very accurately, by shouting into the microphone:

"This is not a law on service, it is a law on evasion of service."

I think that it would have been at least more honest if the Estonian parliament had given it this title.

Estonian Law on Military Service Criticized

PM1704094790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Apr 90 First Edition p1

[Report by Captain Second Rank S. Turchenko, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA special correspondent: "The Hippocratic Oath and Political Intrigues"]

[Text] Tallinn—At the beginning of April, the Estonian Supreme Soviet received a written appeal from a district society of doctors demanding that Estonian youth be immediately recalled from the USSR Armed Forces and this year's conscription program terminated.

I recently visited the Oktyabrskiy Rayon Military Commissariat in the city of Tallinn, where there is a conscription center. Less than 50 percent of those due for conscription actually turned up. And even some of those who did make an appearance said that they refused to do service in the Armed Forces. In short, appeals by "fatherly figures" on the commission for labor service and the "Geneva-49" informal movement have begun to take effect. Where will they lead Estonian youth?

"To be perfectly frank," Colonel E. Kivit, the rayon military commissar, said, "they are inciting Estonian youth to commit a crime."

As far as the appeal by the society of doctors is concerned, I would like to cite the following instance. On 9 April the boiler blew up in the boiler room of the "N" military unit. A soldier was injured. He was taken to Keyla Hospital. But the doctors refused to give the serviceman assistance. The military hospital was 40 kilometers away. The soldier died on the way there. This, incidentally, is not the first time a serviceman in Estonia has been refused medical assistance by a civilian medical establishment.

The Estonian parliament is currently giving a second reading to the draft law "On General Military Service," which envisages substantially limiting the power of the

Union "Law on General Military Service" on the republic's territory and abolishing prosecution for evading service. Where, other than into a legal impasse, will such decisions lead?

Agenda of Estonian Supreme Soviet Viewed

LD1604154190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1508 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Text] Tallinn, 16 April—TASS correspondent Albert Maloveryan reports: The third session of the republic Supreme Soviet opened here today.

The deputies who, for the most part, represent the republic's Russian-language community, proposed including on the agenda the draft laws on citizenship and a referendum and the revocation of the decision to increase prices on a number of foodstuffs and industrial goods, as well as discussion of the measures to provide aid to the population of northeast Estonia, which has been declared an ecological disaster zone. However, these drafts did not receive the required majority when put to vote and were not placed on the agenda.

Draft laws put forward by the People's Front of Estonia do figure on the agenda. These are the draft law on "the symbols of Estonia", which suggests that the current state symbols, the coat of arms, national anthem and flag of the Estonian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] are approved for the duration of the transitional period. The document follows directly and logically from the resolution adopted earlier on "the state status of Estonia", which stresses that Estonia is an occupied country.

Another draft is "the temporary procedure for governing Estonia during the transitional period". This is intended to replace the basic law of the republic until "constitutional bodies of power" are formed. Just how likely is the adoption of this draft at the Supreme Soviet today is hard to say since it became known this morning that an alternative draft may be submitted by the Congress of Citizens of Estonia, which is in favor of the restoration of the bourgeois republic. This organization has more than twenty deputies in the supreme body of state power, the legitimacy of which it does not recognize. Evidently, the People's Front draft was not radical enough.

Calendar for Repeat Elections in Latvia Listed

90UN1384D Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 24 Mar 90 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Calendar Plan: Organization of Repeat Elections of Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic People's Deputy on 29 April 1990"]

[Text] 1. Nomination of candidates for Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] people's deputy—to 12 April inclusive.
2. Registration of candidates for deputy—to 15 April.
3. Publication in the press of reports on the registration of candidates for deputy—no later than the third day after registration.
4. Election campaign for candidates for deputy—from the day of registration to 28 April.
5. Presentation of the lists of voters for general familiarization—on 2 April.
6. Organization of voting prior to election day—from 16 April to 28 April.
7. Times for voting on election day—29 April, from 0700 to 2000 local time.
8. Publication in the press of the district electoral commissions' reports on the results of the elections—no later than 3 May.

RSFSR

Arguments Flare at 1st Moscow Soviet Meeting

LD1604162390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 16 Apr 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] As expected, the new people's deputies of the Moscow City Soviet today began the first session with tough procedural discussion. To date 465 deputies, the majority of which represent the Democratic Russia Bloc, have been elected. Another 34 candidates will acquire mandates during repeat elections set for the end of April. It is planned to conduct the session in two stages. The leadership of Moscow City Soviet and its Executive Committee will be confirmed at the first session; permanent deputy committees and commissions will also be formed. Today arguments flared first and foremost over the composition of working bodies of the session. Apart from that, not having approved authority, a section of deputies proposed an appeal, sharp in tone, to the USSR Supreme Soviet in connection with the upcoming discussion of the work of the investigative group of Gdlyan and Ivanov. Other deputies insisted that this was not an immediate question with which Moscow City Soviet should begin work in the present complex situation.

Deputies Appeal on Gdlyan, Ivanov

LD1604170890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Today, on the first day of the work of the session, toward the end of the day deputies adopted an appeal to the USSR Supreme Soviet. It says, in particular, that the actions of the USSR Procurator's Office and the statements by individual members of the commission of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies on the materials connected with the activity of the investigation group of Gdlyan and Ivanov did not encounter support from a considerable part of electors. We draw the attention of the USSR Supreme Soviet to the fact that a hasty decision on this question may lead to a sharp aggravation of the political situation with unpredictable consequences. We appeal to the USSR Supreme Soviet, the appeal says, and urgently request it to take a considered and objective attitude to the examination of

questions, and make a political and legal assessment of the actions of the USSR Procurator's Office regarding Gdlyan and Ivanov.

I would like to point out that in the voting for this appeal several dozen deputies left the hall in a token of protest against—in their opinion—the unlawful posing of this question.

Blocs Dominate New City Soviet

PM1604232590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 1

[V. Shchepotkin report: "New Moscow City Soviet Starts Work"]

[Text] The first session of the new Moscow City Soviet has started work. Despite the fact that not all seats have been taken yet (Muscovites still have to elect some of the deputies), work is pressing, and therefore the Moscow City Soviet is starting to implement its authority without further ado.

One can hardly say today that the work will be easy. If only because the political leanings of many deputies are unusual. I have already reported that for the first time in many decades a coalition city "parliament" has been set up in Moscow. Most of the seats belong to people making up the "Democratic Russia" bloc. The "Moscow" bloc at the Moscow City Soviet will also be noticeable—according to certain estimates, it has around 100 deputies (as a comparison: "Democratic Russia" has almost three times as many). But there is also a considerable group of independent deputies, they are joined by the "Fatherland" group, and all sorts of other combinations may be possible in the future. The other day one of my heroes phoned me—he has been elected a Moscow City Soviet deputy—and when we got talking it turned out that he was part of the "Democratic Russia" bloc. However, he immediately explained that he had joined it without any definite political outlook. "You yourself know that I'm not a politician, I'm a scientist..."

So new alignments and new consolidations lie ahead. However, one would hope that all this "parliamentary infighting" would not overshadow the main thing—Moscow, its problems, and the needs of the voters—since, for all our respect for deputies' right to self-expression, the main aspect of the activity of the people's representatives is to tackle the interests and problems of the voters.

And today there are probably more problems in Moscow than in many other cities. The gigantically overgrown capital is literally full of problems. That is why the new Moscow City Soviet is getting down to work straightaway and, along with the traditional questions which are always present at any organizational session, is submitting questions which cry out for attention, so to speak. These are the resolution of the housing problem—not least by using not entirely orthodox means—the freeing of the cooperative movement from the shackles of previous regulation, and questions on the press, parties, and the municipal economy.

There is hardly likely to be the unanimity during and after the session that existed in previous times. After all, sometimes the new deputies even refer to the same approach by different names. Some, so they state, will advocate the radicalization of the economy, while others call these aspirations of their colleagues' the road to capitalism. What lies ahead remains to be seen. But for now we wish the new Moscow City Soviet success in its work.

Mordovian Party Secretary, Deputy Expelled

LD1704110490 Moscow World Service in Russian 0935 GMT 17 Apr 90

[Text] Nikolay Medvedev, a Russian people's deputy who is a secretary of the party committee at the Saransk instrument-building works, has been expelled from the party. At a meeting of the Bureau of the Mordovia Oblast Committee of the CPSU he was accused of breaking party rules, factional activity, and membership of the Democratic Platform. In Medvedev's own words, they began persecuting him after a party conference at his works declared its lack of confidence in the leadership of the CPSU oblast committee because of its interference in the running of the recently held elections. He told an INTERFAX correspondent that in most of Mordovia's electoral constituencies the elections were on an uncontested basis. None of the representatives of the party and state apparatus were opposed, Medvedev said. The chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Mordovia Autonomous Republic was likewise elected unopposed.

Baklanov, Ryabev Visit Chelyabinsk Oblast

PM1704095190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Apr 90 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Comprehensive Program Needed"]

[Text] Chelyabinsk, 11 Apr—The pride of the Urals, rightly regarded as a stronghold of power, has resulted in misfortune for it. Many cities here have become an ecological disaster zone. It is difficult to breathe here and the water is polluted with harmful waste. And some wonderful corners of nature where outwardly nothing presages trouble have become dangerous to life.

O.D. Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; L.D. Ryabev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; and leaders of a number of ministries and departments spent four days in this troubled region. With the leaders of the oblast and representatives of the public they carefully studied the situation which perturbs the south Urals inhabitants and affects the vital interests of tens of thousands of inhabitants of the region. The situation has been further complicated by the fact that the construction has begun here of the South Urals nuclear electric power station which, in the

opinion of a substantial section of the population, could aggravate the situation. But another special feature of the situation is that, in the opinion of a number of scientists and specialists, it is precisely a nuclear electric power station distinguished by enhanced safety which will ensure the solution of a whole series of problems connected with the sanitation of the environment and the elimination of the consequences of the 1957 accident. A preliminary assessment of the situation shows that people are often worried because they know far from everything. That is why emotions and objective fear in the fact of radiation create a public opinion far removed from the true state of affairs. That is why the maximum openness and truth are exceptionally important in the present situation. It has been decided to elaborate a comprehensive program to sanitize the region providing for the return of polluted territories and waters into economic circulation and the construction of sociocultural, medical, and other establishments. At the oblast party aktiv there was an exchange of opinions on the state of affairs in the party and the country's economy. Questions of the delimitation of functions in the CPSU and the transition to a planned and market economy and problems of conversion occupied a special place in the talk.

Tambov City, Rayon Party Committees Abolished

LD1604090690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Text] In Tambov the city and rayon party committees have ceased to exist. The decision to abolish them was adopted at a a joint plenum of the city and three rayon party committees. The bureau of the Tambov Oblast party committee has ratified this decision. A special commission has been founded which will generalize proposals for a new structure of the city party committee.

Construction of Volga Atomic Power Station Halted

LD1604092190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Text] A calamity has been averted on the Volga. An atomic power station will not be built by the banks of this great Russian river. This was announced by the leadership of the USSR Ministry of Atomic Power and Industry in reply to a petition from the Ivanovo Oblast executive committee. The ministry has halted the development of the technical-economic grounds for the construction of the Ivanovo atomic district heating station, as well as field and prospecting work.

Gusev Team Probes Ufa Water Poisoning

PM1704093190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Own correspondent Aleksandr Zinovyev report: "Government Commission at Work"]

[Text] Ufa—Rallies are being held in the city. These have been prompted by the criminal irresponsibility of the officials to blame for the poisoning of drinking water with chlorophenol compounds.

The rally participants are demanding the immediate closure of the "Khimprom" Association, whose waste discharges caused the poisoning of the water supply. A strike committee has been set up in the city. It intends to call a warning strike if the demands for the closure of "Khimprom" are not met.

A government commission headed by V. Gusev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, is at work in the Bashkir capital. The commission was set up on the instructions of the USSR president in connection with a request from the Bashkir ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers and the Bashkir party obkom [oblast committee] interim bureau.

The commission has heard reports from the city leaders and specialists on the prevailing situation, familiarized itself with the state of technological discipline at the "Khimprom" Association and the position with regard to water supplies, and met with leaders of enterprises and the city public. Local television organized a broadcast during which V. Gusev; A. Kondrusev, the country's chief sanitation physician and USSR deputy minister of health; and other members of the government commission talked about the measures to normalize the ecological situation in the city and answered the numerous questions phoned in by viewers.

Khabarovsk Kray Party Leader Retires

LD1704094390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 17 Apr 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A plenum of the Khabarovsk Kray committee of the CPSU was held today. It examined an organizational question. The plenum acceded to a request from comrade Pasternak to be released from his duties as first secretary of the CPSU rayon committee and retire on pension. A decision was taken to elect the first secretary of the CPSU rayon committee at a kray party conference, and a commission was formed to examine proposals from the kray's party organisations for candidatures to the post on a contested basis.

Tyumen Oil, Gas Workers' Grievances Examined

PM0604132890 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 13, 1 Apr 90 p 8

[Aleksandr Bekker article: "Warning"—published as part of a feature under the general heading: "Socioeconomic Conflict in Tyumen. Sources, Mechanisms, Prospects"]

[Text] On March 10 Tyumenskaya Pravda published an open letter addressed to Nikolay Ryzhkov, Chairman of

the USSR Council of Ministers, and Stepan Shalayev, Chairman of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions (AUCCTU). Nikolay Trifonov, leader of the Tyumen Regional Committee of Trade Union of Oil and Gas Workers, warned on behalf of its 700,000 members: unless repeated appeals from the work collectives of the region's oil- and gas-extracting industry to the CPSU Central Committee and the government—appeals so far left unanswered—have not been examined by April 1, these collectives will stop work.

In other words, there is the likelihood of a strike. And hence a threat to the already enfeebled economy of the whole country: Tyumen accounts for up to 60 percent of oil and gas extracted in the USSR.

What the oil and gas workers want is merely a dialogue with the government and the AUCCTU. And if they have presented an ultimatum, it is only because they have so far been denied even this.

The gravity of the situation must not be minimized either: it may ease or aggravate depending on what attitude the Centre takes towards Tyumen's demands, which are as follows:

1. Help the Region to build housing and social-cultural facilities through all-Union efforts, since there is practically no construction industry there.

2. Secure a state order so that the oil-and gas-extracting industry should be provided with stocks and materials (including foodstuffs and manufactured goods), and by building various industrial and non-industrial facilities.

3. Decide the question of annually allotting 100 million bricks for the Region's social development.

4. Lower—or freeze at the 1986 level—the prices for products of the engineering industry, for materials and automotive transport, brought into the Region, until there is a reassessment of the price of oil and gas.

5. Set down the regional coefficient and all direct earnings of the sector's workers, keep the northern increments to wages in the event of any kind of dismissal (besides those stipulated by the law).

6. If the government is incapable of complying with these demands in full measure—leave 10-15 percent of extracted oil and gas at the disposal of the Regions oil- and gas-extracting enterprises for sale at home and abroad on contractual prices, without deductions to the state budget for the solution of the region's urgent problems by local efforts.

It should be remembered that originally these demands did not form an ultimatum—there was simply a proposal for discussion. What can be more normal than such a negotiating procedure for the Tyumen oil- and gas-extracting industry, or for any other sector in any other region of the country where the state owns 85 per cent of property? This invitation to set up a dialogue was ignored, however. It looks as if those whom the Tyumen people addressed believed that the calls not to resort to strike action, which resounded from the country's loftiest rostrums since last summer, were meant solely for the working people. The Tyumen situation testifies, however, that responsibility for socio-political stability in society is indivisible. Without this all the correct assumpion about the need for society's consolidation threaten to turn into demagoguery, misunderstood by those for whom they are intended.

Whether it will be possible to avoid this outcome in the Tyuman situation is by no means just a local matter, it is a question of nationwide importance. An answer to the problem can be given by the participants in the dialogue which has yet to take place: a lot of time has been wasted, but something can still be done. Let us not make a mistake like the one made by Leonid Filimonov, Minister of the USSR Oil- and Gas-Extracting Industry, who called the publication of the open letter with an ultimatum mere "provocation".

Union Leader Comments

PM0604133290 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 13, 1 Apr 90 p 9

[Interview with AUCCTU Secretary Karatay Turysov by Andrey Borodenkov: "If the Government Says 'No'"—published as part of a feature under the general heading: "Socioeconomic Conflict in Tyumen. Sources, Mechanisms, Prospects"]

[Text] According to AUCCTU Secretary Karatay Turysov, "The All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions (AUCCTU) will support the oil and gas industry worker's strike in Western Siberia."

MN: What's the reason for your tough stand?

K. T.: The Tyumen workers are absolutely right in their demands. Their work and living conditions are ridiculous, considering the immense profit, including hard currency, they bring into the country. The housing and food shortages, plus the difficulties in providing materials and machinery to the area, should have been settled long ago. In their letter of address, the workers write that they've several times asked the Party's Central Committee and the government to heed their needs.

MN: How about the AUCCTU?

K. T.: That's knocking at the wrong door. We are not responsible for making allocations and distributing funds. It's true that last year we managed to persuade the government not to cut down 580 million roubles as capital investments to the Tyumen Region. Besides, we constantly pressure the builders who always promise to meet the planned volume of housing and social services construction. But then without any remorse they never come through.

MN: However, this time the workers have addressed both the government and the AUCCTU. Their demands are broad and faily explicit. What can the AUCCTU do to meet them?

K. T.: On March 16—less than a week after we had received the address—the Central Committee of the Oil and Gas Industry Workers' Trade Union held a joint meeting with the collegium of the Ministry of the Oil and Gas Industry and worked out a draft resolution to be proposed to the government as to how to fulfil the workers' demands. In our draft we go even further. For example, we think that the oil-producing region shouldn't have just ten or 15 per cent of its hard-currency earnings, but the whole 20. It stands to reason that the workers in the area should have a guaranteed 100 per cent supply of materials and machinery to fulfil state orders, and that all social services facilities have to be built on time according to plan. To say that this is hard to accomplish in the current situation (when relations with the main supplier—Azerbaijan—have become strained and when other Republics are not willing to share their manpower and building materials now that they are shifting to cost accounting) is a lame excuse. Isn't that the government's job—to look for and find solutions? There is only one point the workers from Tyumen have been late with—its their demand to preserve extra payment for the harsh climate for whatever reasons. The government has already resolved this issue simultaneously for them and the miners.

MN: Since you've mentioned miners: the conflict with them has widened the breach in the state budget by three billion roubles. A belated bone to the oil and gas industry workers will probably cost as much. While supporting them, have the trade union leaders asked themselves where the government will find such sums, given the absence of reserves? Won't it happen as in the case with the transport workers, when the strike was prevented at the expense of allowances for mothers of many children? Could it be that this burden will again be dropped onto the shoulders of the most underprivileged, those who do not strike?

K. T.: It could be. But what's to be done? First, we've got to win social justice for those who work.

MN: Don't you fear that some will say you're not interested in people but rather—given this critical situation—you want to mend your marred reputation?

K. T.: I don't understand people who put it that way. When we supported the government, we were blamed for betraying the working people's interests. Today when we are trying to get back our basic functions, we are criticized for trying to gain political capital. But we do not need this.

MN: Do you in the AUCCTU realize what kind of impact a strike in the main area which produces oil and gas could have on the economy?

K. T.: We realize it full well that it could cause a real catastrophe. But we believe that the government should be even more sensitive to this problem. After all, it was through its policy that the situation became so explosive. And its the government's job to take urgent measures.

MN: Is there any way to avoid the strike?

K. T.: A strike is something not to be welcomed, particularly now. On our part, we'll do everything to persuade the government to make concessions. On March 28, we are to meet Lev Ryabev, Vice- Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, in order to discuss the above-mentioned draft resolution. We hope we'll reach a compromise, at least on the most important issues. If not, the government will have to bear full responsibility for the consequences.

Ryabov Gives Views

PM0604133090 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 13, 1 Apr 90 pp 8-9

[Interview with Vice Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and Chairman of the Council of Ministers' Bureau on Fuel and Energy Lev Ryabev by Vladimir Gurevich: "Oil Workers' Woe"—published as part of a feature under the general heading: "Socioeconomic Conflict in Tyumen. Sources, Mechanisms, Prospects"]

[Text] "Moscow knows about the problems of Siberian oilmen and will not let their demands go unanswered," says Lev Ryabev, Vice-Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and Chairman of the Council of Ministers' Bureau on Fuel and Energy.

MN: Trade union leaders representing Siberian oil- and gasmen have warned the government and the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions (AUCCTU) that if they don't receive an answer to their letter by April 1, the workers could stop production. Tyumen produces two-thirds of the USSR's total oil and gas output. Does this mean that a miners' strike there would be much more damaging than elsewhere?

L. Ryabev: Undoubtedly, This would devastate the economy and we would not be able to recoup for a long time. But I hope this won't happen.

MN: But the open letter to Nikolay Ryzhkov and Stepan Shalayev claims that previous appeals have gone unanswered.

L. R.: After the joint session of the Gas and Oil Industry Ministry's Board with the sectoral trade union central committee in February, we travelled all over Tyumen. We met with workers, foremen and engineers. Their demands are serious but they do not want a strike because they know what this would do to the country. Tyumen's problems are acute. I participated in negotiations with the miners last summer: then, the trade unions were lagging behind events, now they seem to be ahead of them. It is understandable that they want to formulate their positions as exactly as possible. But the point they

are raising is very serious. This doesn't mean that the government is ignoring the problems or their solution.

MN: What specifically does the government intend to do?

L. R.: The food situation in Tyumen is grave, state deliveries are being disrupted. To help remedy this situation, Ryzhkov recently signed a decision under which Tyumen oilmen will be able to sell to capitalist countries 400,000 tons of oil and 300 million cu. m. of gas, abroad.

MN: What about the housing problems raised in the letter?

L. R.: Some 150,000 oilmen and their families are on the waiting list for housing, many of them live in wooden sheds. But the problem cannot be solved simply by signing orders, there must also be some economic incentive. We have just met with representatives of various Republics and told them: if you want Siberian oil, then build houses for the oilmen. Their response was unenthusiastic but understanding. Given normal economic relations, services and goods are simply bought, but without rouble this won't work. For now, exchange in kind still works better than orders. Meanwhile, a new building industry base will be created in Western Siberia.

MN: How will it be created?

L.R.: Oilmen will be able to create it with their foreign currency. This year, for the first time ever, they will receive regular foreign currency percentages from exports. If the USSR sells 98 million tons, five per cent of currency will go to producers, on the next 19 million tons sold, producers will receive ten per cent, if another eight million tons go for export, producers will receive 20 per cent of all foreign currency receipts. Thus oilmen will be able to earn a total of 300 million a year in hard currency plus several hundred million in CMEA transferable roubles. Gasmen too will receive foreign currency.

MN: What if they don't manage to fill the state assignments with their resources? One of the miners' demands is that the whole state order for extraction be 100 per cent backed with resources.

L.R.: This is a fair demand. But over the past few months the deliveries of oil extracting equipment from Azerbaijan (worth more than one billion roubles a year) are only ten or 15 per cent of what they should be. We are trying urgently to make use of other heavy machine-building enterprises and the military complex. Oilmen too have their own machine-building capacities, but they are still operating poorly. A meeting with Ryzhkov and the heads of oil-extracting enterprises and their suppliers is planned for early April.

MN: The miners have also demanded that the prices of delivered equipment be cut. In fact, these prices are going up all the time while the prices of oil and gas are fixed.

L.R.: True. But they want the prices of equipment to be reduced to the "substantiated" level. This is a typical contradiction today: independence and marketing freedom for themselves, but tough administrative limits for suppliers. In Kuzbass, too, I came across this. The principled solution would be to have more and more of the output supplied through direct contacts and by contract prices. State wholesale prices will be raised in 1991. Instead of costing 30 roubles per ton wholesale, oil could cost 70 roubles per ton wholesale, oil could cost 70 roubles, and the price of 1,000 cu. m. of gas could go from 26 to 52 roubles.

MN: The miners have said that if the government cannot meet their demands, it should give them 10-15 per cent of their output and they will solve their own problems.

L.R.: In terms of oil, that would mean 60-90 million tons a year. This cannot be done at once. Such a break-up of contacts and deliveries must be thoroughly prepared, though I am sure that this is the right way to go in future. But we are taking a step forward. Until now, all oil was turned over to the state. As of this year, 95 per cent of all oil is state order, the rest is at the producers' disposal. Name your prices, sell to the highest bidder.

MN: But this has already been promised and still the government tries to take away the promised five per cent.

L.R.: The producer must be protected from this. But a more serious problem is: how to use the right to at least five per cent of the oil? It has to be refined and transported and everywhere there must be the proper capacities for this. To my mind the problems can be solved by setting up an all-purpose concern doing everything from extracting and refining the oil to marketing it. In the coal industry, something like this has already been started.

MN: Will the government's reply be published before the miners' deadline of April 1?

L.R.: Yes. And I think that, despite the gravity of the situation, there will be no strike.

Western Republics

Procurator's Office Examines Chernobyl Violations

LD1604184390 Moscow TASS in English 1827 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 16 TASS—The Collegium of the USSR Procurator-General's Office today examined the execution of legislation aimed to overcome the aftereffects of the Chernobyl disaster.

It was noted that, along with considerable work done in this area, there were major drawbacks and omissions. The Procurator's Office regularly exposes cases of criminal disregard for the rules of radiation safety, distortions in reported data on medical aid, embezzlements, as well

as violations of the rules of paying compensation and benefits, medical checkups and treatment.

These and other violations of legality were stopped on procurators' instructions. Criminal cases were instituted on all these violations, which are under special control of the Procurator- General's Office.

The collegium heavily censured the work of procurator's offices in the Ukrainian and Belorussian Republics and Bryansk region of the Russian Federation, which did not efficiently respond to law- breaking.

The USSR Procurator-General's Office has drafted measures to step up procurator's supervision over overcoming the aftereffects of the Chernobyl disaster. A Provision was made to set up special procurator's offices in those areas.

A special commission was set up at the USSR Procurator-General's Office to concert actions to efficiently tackle problems on overcoming aftereffects of the disaster and to ensure radiation safety at nuclear power stations.

Deputies Discuss Chernobyl Aftermath

LD1304191190 Moscow TASS in English 1743 GMT 13 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 13 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent: On the eve of the 4th anniversary of the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station, Soviet parliament comittees for ecology and health care held joint hearings on Thursday and Friday on measures to eliminate the aftermath of the disaster.

They seek to prepare a draft resolution to be discussed at the Soviet parliament session next week.

Speakers emphasised during the hearings that an extremely strained socio-political situation has developed in areas affected by radioactive contamination.

The population in contaminated areas are angry about a delay in taking measures to eliminate the aftermath of the accident and the lack of a well-considered concept for protection against radiation.

Deputies strongly criticised the officially accpeted policy, which sets an aggregate permissible dose of exposure to radiation at 35 rem.

According to specialists at the hearings, specificially Yelena Burlakova, chairwoman of the Radiobiology Research Council of the USSR Academy of Sciences, the 35-rem policy does not take into account the long-term effects of small radiation doses upon human beings. Long-term effects have yet to be studied.

It was also pointed out that thousands of people who live in zones with increased radiation have not been relocated yet. The construction of housing for resettlement is progressing slowly, and there is an insufficient number of individual dosimeters.

The residents of radiation-stricken areas in the Ukraine, Belorussia and Russia have not been fully provided with radiologically clean foodstuffs.

Special concern is aroused by continued agricultural work in areas contaminated by radionuclides without due account of the abnormal situation.

The USSR Supreme Soviet's draft resolution, prepared as a result of the hearings, presupposes an endorsement of programmes worked out in the Ukraine, Belorussian and Russia to protect the population from the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster. The programmes envisage a stage-by-stage relocation of people from contaminated territories and improve living conditions.

The governments of the Union and of the three accident-affected republics are also to be assigned to work out, on the strength of international expert conclusions, a concept under which people can live safely in a radiological situation conditions.

It is planned to set up a USSR State Committee to eliminate the consequences of the Chernobyl accident. Similar agencies will be established in the Ukraine, Belorrussia and Russia.

Chernobyl Damage Estimated at $350 Billion

LD1404055490 Belgrade TANJUG in English 0452 GMT 14 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, April 14 (TANJUG)—The damages brought about through overheating at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant four years ago amounted to R215 billion (almost 350 billion dollars by the official foreign-exchange rate), Soviet Economist Koryakin has said.

Koryakin made known his research results in Leningrad TV.

A wide belt irradiated by way of the accident will become dangerless to life not earlier than in 150 years when the poisoned character of the local ground and its permanent radiation will have gone down to the normal level, he also said.

Ukraine Asks UN for Aid for Chernobyl Cleanup

LD1304212290 Moscow TASS in English 1903 GMT 13 Apr 90

[Text] New York April 13 TASS—The permanent representation of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] at the United Nations sent its secretary-general a message from the republican government, urging broad interaction in eliminating Chernobyl accident consequences.

The pooled efforts of scientists and specialists from different countries, governmental and non-governmental international organisations, the most advanced world experience and engineering and scientific accomplishments can make a substantial contribution to the protection of people and nature from harmful

Chernobyl tragidy consequences, says the message, addressed to the governments, the public of foreign countries and international organisations.

Chernobyl which became a nuclear test range through a human error should become an arena of efficient international cooperation.

Chernobyl Workers Halt Hunger Strike

90P50002 Moscow TRUD in Russian 31 Mar 90 p 1

[Unattributed article: "Hunger Strike Suspended"; for account of hunger strike by former Chernobyl workers in Sverdlovsk, see JPRS Report SOVIET UNION ECONOMIC AFFAIRS, JPRS-UEA-90-009, 14 Mar 90, page 57]

[Text] In yesterday's issue, we announced that hospital patients in Kharkov who had been workers in the Chernobyl accident cleanup, had declared a hunger strike.

On 30 March, the deputy head of Kharkov Oblast's Department of Public Health, Yu. Kononov, stated that the hunger strike has been suspended. This was due, in part, to the decision of the oblispolkom [oblast soviet executive committee] to provide privileges for Chernobyl workers in connection with their social needs. Thus, for instance, additional places have been allocated in Kharkov medical and rehabilitative institutions.

In fact, the Kharkov "Chernobyl" union decided to delay the hunger strike until 26 April, the anniversary of the accident. The local papers report, citing the words of USSR People's Deputy from Kharkov N. Terkyuka, that during this time a government document on privileges for Chernobyl workers will be signed.

Ivashko Addresses Ukrainian Party Plenum

90UN1299A Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 24 Feb 90 pp 1, 2

[Opening remarks of V.A. Ivashko at Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum on 22 February 1990]

[Text] Comrades!

Reality itself has forced us to convene today's Central Committee plenum. The contradictoriness of social and political processes is becoming increasingly apparent. A very tense situation has taken shape. People are deeply disturbed by the destabilization in society, the manifestations of extremism, and the growth of national and in places religious intolerance. Even the territorial unity of the Ukraine itself is in jeopardy.

The destructive forces which, stopping at nothing, are engaged in a direct, open attack on the party and on socialism have given notice of their presence with full voice. They are opposing the authorities both in the center and locally in increasingly organized and purposeful fashion. Even the actual times of mass destructive activities are being given. These processes have intensified considerably now, at the final stage of the election campaign. Groupings of diverse political nuance have united around a single aim: ousting the party under the slogan of combating the apparatus.

All this is taking place against a background of an abrupt slackening of discipline and order, disregard for the law, and a growth of crime. Lax management, the growth of shortages, inflation, and the rampant shadow economy are also having a negative effect on the social and psychological atmosphere.

Unfortunately, under these conditions some communists and primary party organizations and party committees have become confused and have lost the initiative and the capacity for influencing the situation. The gap between the center and the local authorities and between the party committees and the communist rank and file is becoming palpable.

Demands that the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee precisely express its position in respect of the political element are not isolated. It is for this, in fact, that we have met today. I wish for the sake of fairness to remind you that the Central Committee has set forth its approaches to the solution of urgent questions in the election platform and in the speeches of Central Committee secretaries in the mass news media and to audiences. But let us admit that work in connection with the Central Committee platform is being performed extremely unsatisfactorily locally.

At the same time events are now developing extremely dynamically, and the situation is assuming an increasingly dangerous nature. Let us say frankly: It is today a question of the fate of the party and the future of the republic and, yes, of the whole country. And for this reason the Politburo deemed it necessary to convene an enlarged Central Committee plenum to evaluate the political situation as objectively and scrupulously as possible, and to formulate a specific plan of action for a way out of the crisis.

We cannot permit the further division of society and civil confrontation. To what this leads can be seen from the events in other republics. Nothing good comes of conflict and malice.

I am sure that we must primarily today talk about the organizational and ideological unity of the party. Whatever is said, however the party is criticized from "left" and "right," there is currently realistically no other consolidating, international force capable of ensuring society's stable development.

Many examples could be adduced in support of this from the activity of the republic party organization. Constructive dialogue with the scientific and artistic intelligentsia and various public formations conducted only recently have made it possible to enact in the republic sound, democratic laws on languages and elections and to achieve balanced, realistic approaches on such an extremely serious issue as the ecological situation in the

Ukraine. All is possible if work is organized on the basis of sense and responsibility. We will continue perseveringly to move toward a broadening of dialogue ultimately aimed at enlisting all healthy forces in practical work and the solution of urgent problems.

But for this it is necessary that the party itself and all its components be organizationally strong and united in their aspirations and actions. How to achieve this, how to accelerate the processes of renewal in the party whose reference points have been determined in the CPSU Central Committee Draft Platform for the 28th party congress and the election platform of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee?

We need first of all to think about how today to overcome the already obvious trend toward stratification in party ranks and determine our attitude toward the various platforms, factionalism, and the double dealing of certain CPSU members. Finally, how to revive in the party the Leninist spirit of party-mindedness, of which we are in so much need today.

And this work needs to start with the primary party organizations. It is necessary to help them in practice determine their place and role in the restructuring processes. There are very many problems here. For example the place of the party organization in production in the transitional period, and its interaction with the workforce council and other worker associations in defense of the interests of the working people and so forth.

But one thing is obvious: Only by having raised the role of the primary party organizations and the responsibility of each communist for the state of affairs in the outfit and locality and for the accomplishment of specific assignments can we secure both the authority of the party and the success of all perestroyka.

It is essential today to discuss our approaches and basic principles in work on formulating the Central Committee platform for the upcoming Ukrainian Communist Party congress. We proceed from the fact that it should be the basis of the Ukrainian Communist Party Program. It is necessary to confer also on the status of the Ukrainian Communist Party within a renewed CPSU.

We also have to determine our position regarding the timeframe of the report and election campaign and the procedure of the election of delegates to congresses and executive party bodies of all levels. The commission for preparation of the Ukrainian Communist Party congress should be guided by the plenum's recommendations on these matters.

Comrades!

It is understandable that the solution of urgent political problems is organically connected with economic recovery. And we must today map out immediate measures aimed at achieving real improvements in this sphere.

The fundamental approach is determined in the election platform of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee. The essence of it consists of the Ukraine's economic independence within the framework of the Soviet federation based on a new union treaty. And the republic government and the soviet and economic authorities locally should put this approach into practice at once, without waiting for additional decisions. To what do I refer?

First, it has to be seen that a decline in the production growth rate is occurring both in the country as a whole and in the republic. But, understandably, there can be no perestroyka without growth in the production of commodities sorely needed by our people.

For this reason we believe that the communists working in our government, ministries, departments, economic bodies, and enterprises must now abruptly and quickly restructure their activity. We must understand, comrades, that we have embarked on an entirely new stage of economic relations with the other republics, regions, and enterprises. Strict compliance with contract commitments is becoming the main thing. For this reason it is necessary immediately to create a mechanism for protection of the interests of our economy and the Ukrainian people in relations with the other union republics and central state authorities. Relations here should be simple: If some region short-supplies us according to a contract, we will correspondingly reduce supplies of sugar, vegetable oil, or something else by the same percentage. We have no other way.

Second, it is essential that we now protect the republic's interests more intensively also against departmental ruin and sometimes, I would say, against pillage on our territory. We need to switch from words here to actual laws, decrees, and actions by the government and economic authorities.

And the route here has already been determined. It is necessary to have done with departmental diktat from below—through the creation of pools, associations, and concerns for the production of commodities that people sorely need. But today we need to go further—the creation of republic associations under the jurisdiction of the Ukrainian Council of Ministers. The "Yuzhruda" Association, say, making intensive use of our interior, exports a considerable amount of its products overseas. But the republic budget gets nothing from this.

Or, another example. Construction has started on a mining- concentrating works for the treatment of oxidized ores next to Krivoy Rog on the territory of Kirovograd Oblast. It will cost over R2.2 billion. But how much land, how much water is this? And do we need all this at all when operating mining and concentrating works in Krivoy Rog are not working at full capacity?

Both in these and in other similar cases the republic government should not be afraid to assume extra responsibility and, following coordination with the workforce, put such enterprises under republic jurisdiction. We

would then know what our land, water, and air were being used for and what we would be getting for this.

Third, the Central Committee plenum has the right to demand of the communists who are leaders of republic ministries and departments an intensification of supervision of precise fulfillment by the enterprises under their jurisdiction of contract commitments pertaining to product supplies within our republic itself also. We can no longer put up with the situation that has taken shape currently in our own economy, when extremely necessary resources are being sold off to whoever, and due to an absence of such resources our own enterprises are standing idle.

Fourth, we must do everything to ensure that people really perceive the results of their labor and have an opportunity to use a certain particle of what is produced at their enterprises or in the region. And for this it is necessary to increase production (which, of course, is the main thing) and make more persistent use of the advantages that are afforded by the economic reform.

Fifth, we need to emphatically move toward the creation in the republic of state foreign economic authorities, which would have real power to coordinate enterprise activity and create reliable protection against the selling-off of our resources for a pittance.

Even this cursory list of both political and economic problems, whose immediate solution should contribute to the stabilization of the situation in the republic, testifies to the need for an influx of new personnel in all components of the party, state, and economic leadership.

At the same time I believe that we need to firmly state the fundamental unacceptability of "mass meeting" methods of personnel replacement. The party committees and their bureaus and secretaries were elected on the basis of the procedure determined by the party rules. And they should be replaced in the same way. The more so in that the cries of this group of people or the other are far from yet being the voice of the people.

And, finally, we need today to confer one more time with regard to the culmination of the election campaign. It is a question of ensuring the election to the new soviets of people who are intelligent and responsible and who really take the cause of perestroyka to heart. It is ultimately we who will be held responsible if there come to be in the soviets demagogues and political adventurers who use the people's interests as a mask to conceal personal ambitions.

I would like in conclusion to emphasize once again that our Central Committee plenum is being held in an extraordinarily tense period. Seeing the party as a united consolidating force, various groupings united currently under every conceivable banner are conducting a purposeful campaign under the slogans of the oblast, city, and rayon party committees, and party organizations out of the enterprises and so forth. Ultimatums are being presented: Unless we choose between the GDR or Czechoslovak versions, the "Romanian" version cannot be ruled out. Such threats have already been heard in certain speeches at mass meetings in Kiev and Lvov, Kharkov and Donetsk. They do not scare us. But we all need to recognize that there is no crossing that menacing line which separates the tranquillity and life of the Ukrainian people from catastrophe. The people's fate cannot be farmed out to anarchy and emotions.

We need to adopt urgent measures to strengthen law and order and protect tranquillity and, ultimately, the lives of our people themselves.

Provocateurs will stop at nothing. All kinds of rumors about impending acts of violence in respect of people of this nationality or the other, servicemen and their families, communists, and workplace managers have become prevalent recently. I wish to emphasize that for decades the party and its committees and organizations locally have provided full guarantees of the tranquil life of the whole population of the republic, regardless of nationality or affiliation to a particular social group.

Which forces, then, would like to disrupt stability and introduce discord to the life of the Ukrainian people? If we are speaking of those who have initiated in earnest wide-ranging activity pertaining to the revival of Ukrainian culture, the native language and the cultures and languages of other nationalities residing in the Ukraine, they have no connection with these provocations. This was emphasized particularly at the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet session, when the law on languages in our republic was being examined.

It is not honest people, not real patriots who want this. Operating here are people for whom muddy waters, in which it is not difficult to hide an avid thirst for power and the satisfaction of personal ambitions, are extremely beneficial.

And we must tell these forces an emphatic "No."

The communists of the army and the KGB, police, and procuracy authorities are doing everything necessary to give a rap on the knuckles to those who would like to introduce dissension in the people of our republic. I believe that on this score it would be expedient to adopt a separate resolution at our plenum.

We must convey to all communists and each citizen our profound concern at the current situation. In a word, we are expecting today a constructive, high-minded discussion. Let us here narrow the range of questions and concentrate on the most serious, painful, and urgent.

Commission on Crimean Tatars Meets

LD1604181190 Moscow TASS in English 1758 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 16 TASS—The state commission for the problems of the Crimean Tatars has had its regular meeting.

The commission heard a report by the commission's working group that visited the Ukraine in March this year and discussed priority measures to solve matters connected with the creation of necessary socio-economic conditions for the settlement and employment of Crimean Tatars who return to the Crimea.

The commission also considered a draft of a state programme for a voluntary organised return of Crimean Tatars to the Crimean region for permanent residence. The draft was prepared in the Ukraine Council of Ministers with the participation of representatives of the Crimean Tatar people.

The state commission endorsed in the main the above-mentioned documents and issued instructions to specify them with due regard for the exchange of views and suggestions expressed during the meeting.

The commission considered and approved a draft statute of the state commission for the problems of the Crimean Tatar people, in order to subsequently submit it to the USSR Council of Ministers.

The commission meeting was attended by representatives from the public organisations of Crimean Tatars from Uzbekistan and Krasnodar territory.

Ukrainian Orthodox Church Issues Statement

LD1204200490 Moscow TASS in English 1937 GMT 12 Apr 90

[Text] Kiev April 12 TASS—The Holy Synod of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church today released a statement on the decision by the Lvov City Council of People's Deputies of April 6 to transfer the St. George Cathedral to the community of Catholics of Eastern Rites.

"By this decision the Lvov City Council deprived Ukrainian Orthodox believers in Lvov of their last temple, without offering any replacement," the statement says.

It stresses that "neither the Bishop's Office of Catholics of Eastern rites nor the Council of People's Deputies are empowered to (?annul) the decisions of the quadripartite commission which the Moscow Patriarchate Hierarchs' Assembly and Pope John Paul established jointly. This commission has called for a peaceful settlement of disputes over the distribution of temples between Orthodox communities and those of Catholics of Eastern Rites."

Synod members are appealing to Ukrainian people's deputies. The republican government, all believers and non-believers: "We ask for prerequisites to be created to heal the deep religious wound. We are appealing to good sense, we are calling for an end to violence and discrimination and for the restoration of justice and law."

Lithuanian Residents Seek Belorussia Asylum

PM1604232790 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 17 Apr 90 p 3

[Own correspondent V. Legankov report: "Requesting Political Asylum"]

[Text] Minsk, 16 Apr—Around 20 Lithuanian residents, including Belorussians, Russians, Poles, and people of other nationalities, picketed Government House in Minsk 14 April. Among the slogans they were carrying, one was dominant: "We request political asylum in the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]."

The demonstrators were received by V.A. Mikulich, chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium. He was handed the text of an appeal to the Belorussian people bearing hundreds of signatures, as well as letters and statements from Lithuanian SSR citizens requesting political asylum and help in solving the problems associated with their resettlement from Lithuania.

V.A. Mikulich noted that the Belorussian people understand the alarm felt by many of the neighboring republic's inhabitants, and assured them that Belorussia's supreme organs of power would treat the documents handed to him with all seriousness.

Moldavians Reiterate Need for Self-Determination

LD1604194290 Moscow TASS in English 1853 GMT 16 Apr 90

[By TASS correspondent Anatoliy Golya]

[Text] Kishinev April 16 TASS—A round table involving representativs and leaders of public organisations and political movements of Moldavia concluded its work here today.

The sides adopted a joint statement which says that more than twenty public organisations and movements of the republic which took part in the discussion were satisfied that the discussion of present issues can only be conducted in an atmosphere of goodwill and constructive approach.

Roundtable participants admitted the need to realise the Moldavian people's right to self-determination which is expressed in its desire to reach full political and economic sovereignty.

Round table participants stressed the need to lay down in legislation the principle of the multi-party system. At the same time they recognised as inadmissible the activity of parties and other organisations and movements which favour or use violence, fan inter-ethnic strife, work towards the dictatorship of a social group and deny Moldavia's right to territorial integrity and sovereignty.

The signatories called upon the republic's population to abstain from participating in unauthorised meetings and demonstrators which have become particularly frequent lately.

The statement will be handed to newly-elected deputies of Moldavia who will assemble for the first session of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet on Tuesday.

Caucasus

Inter-Ethnic Crime Increasing in Transcaucasus

LD1704103390 Moscow World Service in Russian 0935 GMT 17 Apr 90

[From the "Soviet Chronicle" feature of the "Soviet Union Day by Day" program; report attributed to INTERFAX]

[Text] A correspondent for the agency reports that the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast has deteriorated noticeably over recent days. There has been an increase in the number of inter-ethnically based crimes. Shooting incidents and stoning of vehicles have again become more frequent, and there have been casualties. Exchanges of fire occur constantly in Kirkidzhan, one of the outlying districts of Stepanakert where both Armenians and Azerbaijanis live. Troop patrols have also come under fire. The INTERFAX correspondent notes that the local Armenian population continues to deny recognition to the republican organizing committee which has come to Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast from Baku and whose tasks include restoring the oblast's organs of authority.

Armenian Internal Affairs Ministry Issues Report

NC1704100190 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 15 Apr 90

[Report by the Armenian SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs]

[Text] During the period of (?April 9) to 15, 1990 the operative situation was [words indistinct] with the illegal acts by various hooligan groups which further exacerbated the already tense situation in Yerevan. During the week, the mass media reported on the attacks on the buildings of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium and on the republic's Committee for State Security. Law enforcement bodies have taken (?serious) operative steps to track down and to punish the perpetrators.

Also, several armed attacks on military installations, and state and educational institutions from which [words indistinct], air rifles, and other (?arms) were stolen. By taking into consideration the threat to the public by the acts of these groups, internal affairs bodies have taken steps to identify and to arrest them.

Armenian Party Issues Appeal on Elections

NC0604142890 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Yerevan, 4 Apr (ARMENPRES)—The republican press has published the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee's appeal to the workers and citizens of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic in connection with the upcoming elections in Armenia. The appeal states:

In view of the prevailing situation and out of its reliance on the sustained activism of the people, the September 1988 plenum of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee proposed a realistic and well-considered program intended to form the basis of a national plan for renewal and renaissance. However, the destructive earthquake, the unresolved problem of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO], the presence of nearly 300,000 refugees, the recurring blockade, and the deep and grave deformations inherited from the stagnation period greatly exacerbated the socioeconomic situation in the republic, damaged its national economic structure, and prevented the timely and comprehensive implementation of the program's decisions.

Enormous efforts are required to eliminate the consequences of the earthquake. The Soviet Union, all union republics, and the international community showed deep sorrow and warm compassion toward the grief of the Armenian people and provided generous concrete assistance and support to the Armenian people.

Measures are being taken at present to bring about a sharp turn in the efforts to eliminate the consequences of the earthquake.

At this complex time for the republic, the Central Committee is devoting particular attention to the problems of interethnic relations and the solution of the NKAO problem. The Armenian Communist Party's position on this issue is well known and was expressed clearly at the congresses of the USSR people's deputies, the CPSU plenums, and the sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the republic's Supreme Soviet.

Particular care is required as regards the refugees. Naturally, their proper resettlement and job placement cannot be accomplished in a day. A comprehensive plan to solve the problems of the refugees is being drawn up with the intention of creating the necessary conditions for their full integration into all spheres of economic life in the republic.

The Armenian Communist Party Central Committee shares the concern of the republic's population as regards the exacerbation of the ecological situation. It has a radical approach to resolving the complex underlying problems which have emerged in this domain. A qualitatively new policy to improve and protect the environment is being implemented. Already, the nuclear power plant and the Alaverdi metallurgical mining combine have been shut down and a number of ecologically

harmful operations have been terminated at the Kirovakan chemical factory and the "Nairit" scientific- production association. We will unflinchingly continue the comprehensive work for the radical improvement of the republic's ecological situation and will ensure the development of a qualitatively new eco-system.

Work is continuing on the formulation and implementation of a national plan to extricate the republic from the social and economic crisis.

Concrete and practical steps are being taken for the further advancement of science, the national culture, and higher and intermediary schools, for the broader use of the Armenian language as a state language in the republic, and for the elimination of any blank spots in Armenian history.

The successful solution of the fundamental political, social, national, and economic problems which have come to a head will depend on those who take their seats at the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet and in the city and (?rayon) soviets of people's deputies. These persons should be completely devoted to the national interests and active and honest people who will put all their efforts, knowledge, and energy at the service of the people.

The Armenian Communist Party Central Committee appeals to all inhabitants of the republic—men and women, veterans and young people, workers and rural laborers, intellectuals, and the fighters of the Soviet Army—to participate actively in the elections and vote for those who actively support reforms and who think and act responsibly and collectively.

Reports Indicate Chemical Leak Will Poison Crop

NC1604093190 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1530 GMT 15 Apr 90

[From the republican press review]

[Text] A liquid mixture containing chloroprene was released into the atmosphere from the liquid chemical materials storage unit at the rubber production sector of the Nairit scientific-production association at 0745 [0245] on 14 April 1990.

KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN publishes a statement about this which argues that the forced closure of Nairit last December caused the accident because it was not then possible to implement necessary prodecures to protect the materials. However, this unsigned statement does not mention that the decision to close the Nairit scientific-production association was made on 14 June 1989, during the session of the Supreme Soviet. The closure of the association should not surprise anyone, especially the security services of the association, even though six months have passed since the decision was adopted.

The accident was contained because measures were taken quickly.

The same unsigned statement declares that the concentrated materials released pose no danger to humans. In reality, the chloroprene mixture not only escaped into the atmosphere but also thoroughly penetrated the soil and water and inevitably will poison the crops in the Ararat plain.

Azerbaijan Court Jails Armenian Gang Members

PM1704092190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Apr 90 Second Edition p 1

[AZERINFORM-TASS report: "Sentence Passed"]

[Text] Baku—B.A. Kocharyan, K.L. Kazaryan, M.V. Musaelyan, S.A. Mkrtchyan, and A.G. Abramyan, inhabitants of Kafan city, Armenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], were detained by law enforcement organs in Zangelanskiy Rayon, Azerbaijan SSR 2 August 1989, armed with home-made explosive devices, hand-grenades, a pistol, and a sawed-off gun.

After the completion of the investigation which was carried out by the Azerbaijan SSR Prosecutor's Office and KGB, the criminal case concerning the aforementioned individuals was passed on to the republic Supreme Court for examination.

The panel of judges of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Court passed a verdict 13 April sentencing Kocharyan, Kazaryan, and Mkrtchyan, who already had criminal records, to nine, eight, and six years imprisonment respectively, to be served in a strict-regime colony, and Musaelyan and Abramyan to five years imprisonment, to be served in an intensified-regime colony.

Baku Encourages Russian Refugees To Return

PM1504164390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Asim Dzhalilov report under the rubric "Direct Line": "Road Home"]

[Text] Baku—The Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee and the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers have adopted a joint resolution creating conditions for the unhindered return to the republic of the Russian-speaking population and for the suspension of the unfounded emigration from the republic.

Local soviet executive committees together with internal affairs organs and leaders of ministries, departments, and appropriate enterprises, establishments, and organizations are entrusted with setting up a record of the Russian-speaking population's migration without delay, making contact with those who have left, and giving practical assistance in moving to places of permanent residence and moving into abandoned apartments. All travel and property transportation costs will be reimbursed in full here. Material assistance will also be given to pensioners forced to leave their homes.

Persons returning home are guaranteed reinstatement at their former place of work (study) without delay, but in its absence equivalent work will be provided in accordance with their wishes or, where necessary, training in other professions will be organized. Questions of reinstating a continuous work record will also be resolved as laid down.

The document emphasizes the need to create the most favorable conditions possible for the study and equitable use of the Azeri and Russian languages in all spheres of activity.

The republic's law enforcement organs have been entrusted with taking measures to strengthen public order and legality and with ensuring the safety, the reliable protection of the life, rights, freedoms, and property of the republic's citizens regardless of nationality, and the inviolability of their dwellings and property.

Mutalibov Visits Rayon Centers, Discusses Borders

NC1704084490 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 11 Apr 90

[Text] Ayaz Mutalibov, first secrtary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, and Colonel General Shatalin, head of the USSR Interior Ministry troops, have visited Kubatly, after visiting Agdam. Mutalibov, Shatalin, and Polyanichko, who is the chairman of the republic's Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast Organization Committee, held meetings in Kubatly, Zangelan, and Lachin and exchanged views on the situation of the rayons which border Armenia.

Rallies Call for Georgian Independence

LD1704104890 Moscow World Service in Russian 0935 GMT 17 Apr 90

[From the "Soviet Chronicle" feature of the "Soviet Union Day by Day" program; report attributed to INTERFAX]

[Text] An INTERFAX correspondent reports that rallies held in recent days in Tbilisi have focussed on the deterioration of the situation in the South Ossetia Autonomous Olbast in Georgia, where anti-Georgian feeling is rife. Those taking part presented the republic's leadership with an ultimatum, to take cardinal measures within a week to normalize the situation in South Ossetia. Otherwise, the rallies heard, mass strikes, a blockade of the autonomous oblast and picketing of the buildings of the Communist Party Central Committee, the Georgian Supreme Soviet Presidium, Council of Ministers, Internal Affairs Ministry, and State Security Committee, as well as of the headquarters of the Transcaucasian Military District, will begin.

Demands were also voiced at the rallies for a referendum to be held on independence for Georgia. The INTERFAX correspondent reports that a protest action was staged outside the building of the Military Commandant in Tbilisi against the detention of Georgian young men evading conscription.

Rustavi Metal Workers Strike Still Possible

PM1704094190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Own correspondent Besik Urigashvili report: "Will Rustavi Metal Workers Strike?"]

[Text] Tbilisi—A tented village has been set up outside the administrative building of the Rustavi metallurgical plant—the largest such plant in Georgia. The organizing committee for the strikers at the plant has taken up residence there.

Events developed as follows. On 11 March members of the organizing committee handed the plant administration their demands: to dissolve the party and Komsomol [All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League] organizations at the enterprise, to increase the pay of workers and employees by an average of 50 percent, to free the plant's in-house newspaper—METALLURG—of party and administrative diktat, to remove the enterprise from Union jurisdiction, to disband the plant's labor collective council...

All the demands were to have been examined at a 20 March session of the labor collective council. But this did not happen, and the organizing committee worked out a plan for a strike. Several other points were added to the demands, including the disbandment of the plant trade union as the defender of the administration's interests, and talks between members of the strike organizing committee and representatives of the republic's Council of Ministers and trade union council.

This meeting was held 29 March, when all the main sections of the enterprise—with the exception of the open-hearth mill—were shut down for a few hours. B. Makharashvili, deputy chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers, and P. Chkheidze, chairman of the trade union council, met with the strikers. Agreement was reached on many points and a specific timetable for their implementation was mapped out. The strike was called off.

Nonetheless, 15 members of the organizing committee are continuing their protest. As their representative—P. Kurtsikidze, member of the Georgian Metal Workers Free Trade Union and a foreman at the casting shop—stated, if real measures are not taken to carry out the demands on which agreement was reached, the organizing committee retains the right to resort to an all-out strike.

Correction to Armenian KGB Statement

NC1704051690

The following correction pertains to the item entitled "Armenian KGB Issues Statement" on page 125 of the 16 April DAILY REPORT:

Page 126, column one, second full paragraph, last sentence should read: ...in the crowd started to beat up on those who began to urge prudence. (supplying dropped words)

Central Asia

Kara-Kalpak Supreme Soviet Elects Chairman

LD1604151190 Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian 18 Mar 90 p 7

[Text] The first session of the Kara-Kalpak ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet of the 12th convocation has opened in Nukus. Deputies are discussing questions involved in the formation of Supreme Soviet organs, of the autonomous republic's Council of Ministers and of other bodies accountable to the Supreme Soviet.

T.A. Yeshimbetova was elected chairman of the Kara-Kalpak ASSR Supreme Soviet at the session. A.Kh. Tadzhiyev was appointed chairman of the Kara-Kalpak ASSR Council of Ministers.

The session is continuing its work.

Uzbek Training Commission Formed

LD1604163190 Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian 15 Apr 90 p 3

[Summary] Today's paper reports a decision by the presidium of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet to set up at the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers a commission to coordinate work to train scientific, engineering, and management cadres. It lists the commission's members and names its chairman as Sh.A. Vakhidov.

New Business Newspaper Published in Tashkent

LD1604225190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2018 GMT 16 Apr 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Summary] The first issue of a new newspaper entitled DELOVOY PARTNER has just been published in Tashkent. It is an information and advertising medium for the Chamber of Trade and Industry of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic. Issue one is available in Uzbek and Russian editions, but an English-language version is planned. The newspaper is aimed at anyone seeking to establish foreign business contacts, and at informing foreigners about Uzbekistan's export potential.

Anti-Nuclear Congress Planned for Kazakhstan

LD1604160190 Moscow TASS in English 1530 GMT 16 Apr 90

[Text] Alma Ata April 16 TASS—By TASS correspondent Raisa Ioffe:

Peace champions in Kazakhstan, a Soviet Central Asian Republic, are getting ready to welcome delegates to the World Voters Against Nuclear Weapons Congress, which is to open here at the end of May. Its sponsors include the Anti-Nuclear Nevada-Semipalatinsk Movement and the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear Organisation.

"Openness will be the congress's main feature. It will give 400 Soviet and 300 foreign delegates a chance to engage in a constructive dialogue," president of the Nevada-Semipalatinsk Movement, prominent writer and Soviet People's Deputy Olzhas Suleimenov told a news conference here. "A voter is no longer a citizen, a master of his land and of his destiny, a free man on whose decisions mankind's future depends."

The congress will discuss problems, the solutions of which are necessary for a brighter future—the political prospects of a ban on nuclear weapon tests, the effect of small doses of radiation on humans, the problem of nuclear wastes and methods of control. One of the forum's main tasks is to draw up a memorandum addressed to leaders of the USSR and the United States, before their summit meeting.

Stressing that the anti-nuclear movement was assuming global scope, Olzhas Suleimenov noted the contribution made to this process by the Nevada-Semipalatinsk Movement. Its efforts helped prevent 11 out of 18 planned nuclear blasts in the USSR last year. The Semipalatisk nuclear testing ground has been silent for almost six months. Its complete closure, aid to test victims and implementation of a large-scope programme to restore the earth's ecology largely depend on the success of the congress.